1979

Boisrobert's "Nouvelles Heroiques Et Amoureuses" and the "Histoire Indienne": His Prose Adaptations From the Spanish.

Katherine S. King
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

BOISROBERT'S NOUVELLES HEROIQUES ET AMOUREUSES AND THE HISTOIRE INDIENNE: HIS PROSE ADAPTATIONS FROM THE SPANISH

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Foreign Languages

by
Katherine S. King
B.A., Louisiana State University, 1972
M.A., Louisiana State University, 1975
August 1979

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my appreciation to the members of my dissertation committee, Drs. Kim Johns, Harry Kirby, James Redfern, and Lester Roubey, for their review of the manuscript. They provided valuable assistance in the completion of this study. I am especially grateful to Dr. Redfern for his meticulous reading of the manuscript and cogent suggestions.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Frederick A. de Armas. His enlightening courses on Golden Age drama were a source of inspiration, and encouraged me to love and appreciate the literature of this epoch. As my major professor, Dr. De Armas has been responsible for directing this study. I am grateful for his guidance and assistance during the course of this project.

There are many other people who deserve recognition for their generous support throughout my graduate career. They are too numerous to name. I trust that my family and friends know that I will always remember their patience and understanding. I am most endebted to my father for his love and encouragement throughout my studies, and deeply regret that he did not live to see the completion of my dissertation. He provided continual support and confidence, and never questioned my need to pursue the doctoral degree nor doubted my ability to complete it.

PREFACE

The subject of this dissertation is Boisrobert's prose adaptations: Les Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses (1657), a collection of four nouvelles; and the Histoire indienne d'Anaxandre et d'Orazie (1629), Boisrobert's only novel. Neither of these works has been republished since the original seventeenth-century printings, and critical information on both is scarce. No previous study has dealt with either of these volumes in depth, and critics have limited themselves to brief commentaries on Boisrobert's prose fiction.

A brief chronological review of Boisrobert's principal biographers reveals the lack of existing documentation. In the Historiettes, Tallemant des Réaux, a contemporary of Boisrobert, criticizes the quality of the abbot's Nouvelles, but does not elaborate on specific faults. Célestin Hippeau devotes a chapter of Les Ecrivains Normands au XVII^{e} siècle (1858) to Boisrobert. Basing his observations largely on material found in Tallemant and in Boisrobert's Epistres, Hippeau concentrates on biographical information, excluding any reference to Boisrobert's prose adaptations. An extensive study of Boisrobert's dramatic adaptations, François le Métel de Bois-Robert als Dramatiker und Nachahmer des spanischen Dramas, was effected by Fritz Tenner in 1907, but necessarily excludes his prose fiction. Boisrobert's major biographer, Emile Magne, lauds the Histoire indienne in his Le Plaisant

Abbé de Boisrobert (1909), but in a footnote which does little more than highlight the novel's action. His remarks on the Nouvelles repeat information found in the Historiettes, while focusing on the ensuing quarrel between Boisrobert and Scarron which will be examined in Chapter 3 of the present study. Maurice Cauchie's publication in 1921 of Boisrobert's Epistres en Vers (1646 and 1659) comprises the first reprinting since the seventeenth century of these two volumes. Cauchie's edition is a noteworthy contribution to scholarship on the author, but editorial commentary is of necessity limited to biographical information presented in the Epistres. The only detailed analysis of a nouvelle prior to the present study is a succinct article in 1939 by Marie Malkiewicz, "Un Remaniement français de 'La vie est un songe.'" Malkiewicz's examination of the Spanish comedia and the French nouvelle represents a perceptive contribution to scholarship on "La vie n'est qu'un songe," and will be discussed in the analysis of these two works in Chapter 4.

Among literary historians who have assigned sections to Boisrobert are Henry Carrington Lancaster (1929-1940) and Antoine Adam (1947-1956). The former is restricted to Boisrobert's dramatic production, and both histories are of too great a scope to execute a comprehensive examination of any one author. Other notable references to Boisrobert include: G. Hainsworth's Les "Novelas exemplares" de Cervantes en France au XVII^{e} siècle (1933); James Wilson Coke's dissertation on Boisrobert's less famous brother, Antoine le Métel, sieur d'Ouville (1958); and Frederick A. de Armas' biography on Scarron (1972). In the afore-mentioned study by Hainsworth, the

author identifies the sources of two of the nouvelles and subsequently identifies the remaining two in an article published in 1947. Hainsworth does not consider the nouvelles of value outside their role of popularizing a Spanish vogue in France, and limits his observations to this historical perspective. Coke's dissertation concentrates only on areas in which Boisrobert's life or works affected those of his brother. The Nouvelles are thus mentioned in relation to the quarrel which resulted with Scarron, but Coke provides no information on their content or form. De Armas' biography on Scarron similarly focuses on Boisrobert's Nouvelles in relation to the forementioned quarrel, and does not purport to examine the individual nouvelles.

As the above review of Boisrobert's major biographers has shown, analyses of the author's prose fiction prior to the present study was practically nonexistent. This study was designed to provide an extensive examination of Boisrobert's prose adaptations. In view of this primary purpose, additional commentaries on the author's life and time were also considered essential. Chapter 1 utilizes the Epistres en Vers and existing documentation to provide biographical information about the author. In Chapter 2, the origin of the nouvelle is traced and the genre defined. Chapter 3 examines the quarrel in which Boisrobert, d'Ouville, and Scarron were embroiled and provides new insight into this extended controversy. In Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 each of the four nouvelles and their respective sources are examined, and Chapter 8 is devoted to the author's novel. In Chapter 9, the information presented in the preceding chapters is summarized with concluding commentary. Original orthography has been maintained in

all citations, but titles which do not distinguish "v" and "u" have been modernized, i. e. Nouvelles instead of Novvelles.

This study does not pretend to be an exhaustive biography on Boisrobert's life and works. The author also published no fewer than eighteen theatrical plays including a dramatization of the Histoire indienne d'Anaxandre et d'Orazie. An examination of this theater was considered outside the scope of the present study, and the subject was limited to Boisrobert's prose fiction and historiographical material found in the Epistres en Vers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

PREFACE iii

ABSTRACT viii

Chapter

1. BIOGRAPHY 1

2. NOVELLA, NOVELA, NOUVELLE 41

3. QUARREL 67

4. THE FIRST NOUVELLE: "L'HEUREUX DESESPOIR" 81

5. THE SECOND NOUVELLE: "L'INCESTE SUPPOSE" 118

6. THE THIRD NOUVELLE: "PLUS D'EFFETS QUE DE PAROLES . . 139

7. THE LAST NOUVELLE: "LA VIE N'EST QU'UN SONGE" 178

8. BOISROBERT'S ONLY NOVEL: L'HISTOIRE INDIENNE 210

9. CONCLUSION 232

BIBLIOGRAPHY 238

VITA 245

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this dissertation was to examine the prose fiction of Boisrobert, and to situate his life and works vis-à-vis a cultural and historical perspective. Boisrobert spent more than forty years at court, almost twenty of which were spent as Richelieu's favorite. His Epistres en Vers (1646 and 1659) are consequently a valuable source for information on courtly intrigue and politics of this epoch. The death of Richelieu resulted in the abbot's loss of favor at court, and he was to persist in glorifying the years spent as Richelieu's favorite in epistles written as late as 1658, sixteen years after the cardinal's death. Boisrobert was instrumental in the creation of the French Academy, but this role was not universally acknowledged by his contemporaries. The authors of an anonymous and prejudicial pamphlet, the Boscorobertine (1659), unjustly attacked Boisrobert as an unworthy member and concluded that his admission to this illustrious society was based solely on the cardinal's favor.

This study traced the origin of the nouvelle in order to evaluate the originality of the Cervantine novela and its consequent impact on imitations. Cervantes' Novelas ejemplares, first published in 1613 and translated into French in 1615, marked a new era for this genre. The Spanish comedia and novela were closely related in the seventeenth-century and this interdependence produced what has been called a comedia novelesca and a novela comediesca. An analogous pattern was

shown to exist in the influence that the two genres exerted in France. Theatrical works were adapted from the Spanish novela and French nouvelles were similarly based on Spanish comedias. D'Ouville is credited with the initiation of a Spanish vogue in the theater (1639); Scarron, in the nouvelle (1656). The mutual exploitation of Spanish literature by Boisrobert, d'Ouville, and Scarron resulted in an extended quarrel between the three authors. The examination by the present study offers new insight into this quarrel thereby nullifying d'Ouville's responsibility and incriminating Boisrobert.

A major portion of this dissertation was devoted to an analysis of Boisrobert's Les Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses (1657). Three of the four nouvelles are directly adapted from Spanish works, and the other is based on a French tragi-comedy which was in turn adapted from two Spanish comedias. The analysis of Boisrobert's adaptations revealed that the author retained very little that was typically Spanish, and the nouvelles are consequently a representative illustration of the political and philosophical distances that existed between the two countries. The Spanish comedias and novelas are baroque, irrational, and sentimental. The action is complex, extended over a greater period of time, and often incorporates elements of the supernatural not to be found in the French adaptations. Boisrobert's nouvelles represent the spirit of French individualism; the comedias and novelas, that of Spanish collectivism.

Boisrobert's only novel, the Histoire indienne (1629) was also studied, and this examination produced conclusive evidence that the novel was based on a Spanish text, without determining, however, the

exact source. The discovery of certain elements in the novel which reappear in La Vida es sueño points to the existence of a common text utilized by both authors.

Boisrobert was a minor author of the seventeenth century but is nonetheless notable for his contributions. His most noteworthy accomplishments which justify an examination of his works include: the creation of the French Academy; the portrayal of courtly intrigue and politics as seen in the Epistres; and the illustration of the political and cultural differences which distinguished seventeenth-century France and Spain as exemplified by the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses.

Chapter 1

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

The aim of this chapter is to present important basic biographical information about Boisrobert and the milieu in which he lived. The author was both the product and representative of the period in which he lived, and any opinions or judgments must be formulated within this context. As a member of the clergy, he was bitterly condemned by many of his contemporaries for his notorious lack of religious belief. Yet the granting of religious titles and territories as compensation for non-secular services was common practice in seventeenth-century France. As Boisrobert's personal morals were a constant source of aggravation to himself as well as to both his friends and enemies, a section of this chapter will examine the abbot's morals and synopsize available information on the subject.

The material in this chapter will be presented in the following order: Biography (birth, death, ennoblement, d'Ouville); Epistres en Vers (artistic value and historical and biographical importance); French Academy (Boisrobert's role as creator and promoter); Richelieu's Favorite (acquisition of the title and subsequent favors rendered to his contemporaries); Boisrobert's Morals (gambling, drinking, homosexuality, libertinage, humor); Boisrobert's Relationship with Richelieu (commentary by critics and contemporaries and by Boisrobert, disgrace, death).

Boisrobert's relationship with Cardinal Richelieu was a crucial factor in the abbot's life. As the final section of this chapter will show, the cardinal and the privileges Boisrobert enjoyed as his favorite were to obsess Boisrobert until his death.

Biography

François le Métel, sieur de Boisrobert, was born of Protestant parents in Normandy, in either Caen or Rouen, between 1589 and 1592. The exact date and place of his birth can not be proved with certainty. Antoine Adam favors the city of Caen and the year 1589, a conjecture he bases not on concrete evidence but on its lack.[1] Maurice Cauchie, having shown that no records of Boisrobert's birth are to be found in the baptismal registers in Caen between 1590 and 1594, and those registers from July 21, 1580 to December 31, 1589 having disappeared, Adam concurs with Cauchie in concluding that Boisrobert was born in Caen in 1589.

Boisrobert's parents lived in Rouen, but in 1589 were forced to flee to Caen, along with the Parlement of Rouen, when fighting erupted in their native city. Henri III's death in August of this year had left the kingdom divided between the Protestant, Henri IV, whose promised conversion within six months pleased neither Catholics nor Protestants, and the aged Cardinal of Bourbon, proclaimed legal heir by the Duc de Mayenne. Rouen was thus to be the first battle sight in Henri IV's effort to conquer his realm step by step.[2]

With respect to these events, Cauchie consequently concludes that Boisrobert was born between July 1 and December 31, 1589. This date

would moreover correspond with the age of seventy-two given in the burial records to Boisrobert at the time of his death in 1662. Cauchie states that register number forty-eight of the civil state of Saint Roch Parish, which was destroyed in 1871, had born the following inscription: "Du Xj. avril 1662. M^re François Mettay, abbé de Boisrobert, aagé d'environ 72 ans, a esté inhumé dans la cave de cette Eglise. Pris rue de Richelieu."[3]

The exact day of Boisrobert's death has long been disputed. Cauchie states that a letter by Jean Loret, incorrectly dated April 8, stating that Boisrobert has been: "Depuis dix jours dans le cercueil," (Epistres, II, 301) is the source of the erroneous postulation that he died on March 29. In effect, Cauchie shows this letter to actually be of April 15, a fact born out by Loret's concluding verses: "Le quinze Avril, ô cher Lecteur, / J'ay de ces Vers été l'Autheur." (Epistres, II, 302) Cauchie thus concludes that had Boisrobert been in the tomb for ten days on April 15, the date of his death would be April 5, a date which would logically coincide with his burial on April 11, 1662.

Letters of nobility. Boisrobert was the son of Jérémie le Métel, sieur d'Ouville and Jeanne de Lion. His father was a lawyer in the Parlement of Rouen, and the family was granted the title of nobility largely due to Boisrobert's influence at court. The "Lettres de noblesse de la famille le Métel," dated June 1636[4] indicate that his mother was of a noble and ancient family of the province of Normandy. Boisrobert verifies his mother's nobility in an epistle written in 1649 to the Chancellor of France, Pierre Seguier, in which he states:

"Non sans chagrin, j'oyois souvent ma mere, / Noble de sang, reprocher à mon pere / Qu'il n'estoit pas de mesme qualité." (Epistres, II, 32) In another epistle to Seguier a few years later, Boisrobert again mentions his mother's nobility: "Ma mere fut noble de Sang; / Mon Pere, avant qu'estre en ce rang, /Fut un Advocat honorable." (Epistres, II, 151) The "Lettres de Noblesse" purport to ennoble Jérémie le Mêtel and all his children, both male and female, in honor of their merit and services. Boisrobert is the only one of the children mentioned by name, with reference being made to more than fifteen years service on the part of an elder unnamed son.

In an epistle which dates from the early 1650's, Boisrobert complains of this ennoblement to Seguier. The point of grievance is a tax which had recently been levied on the new nobility. Boisrobert offers to return his "lettres de noblesse" if Seguier can not grant him a dispensation from this tax:

> S'il est bien vray ce qu'on m'a dit,
> Qu'on a fait un nouvel Edit
> Contre les nouveaux Gentils-hommes,
> Qu'on taxe à de bien rudes sommes,
> Je te vay rendre dés demain
> Ce que j'ay receu de ta main. (Epistres, II, 149)

Boisrobert writes that he has learned that the "Illustre" Corneille, whose family had been ennobled in 1637, suffers the same disgrace, and he asks: "Penses-tu que les bons Autheurs / Soient un Gibier à Collecteurs"? (Epistres, II, 150) Boisrobert had, in 1649, reproached the chancellor for having ennobled his family, and he warns him that he will again be reproached if this tax is effected: "Si tu sens que le taxe approche, / Sauve-toy d'un second reproche." (Epistres, II, 151)

Disenchanted by the additional burdens brought by his title of nobility, the abbot claims that were he to begin again, he would do without this title: "Si j'estois à recommencer, / Tu vois qu'on s'en pourroit passer." (Epistres, II, 153)

In the aforementioned epistle of 1649 to Seguier, Boisrobert, who requests a reprieve for his three nephews who were charged with murder, blames the chancellor's favor on his present misery. Had Seguier not ennobled his family, writes Boisrobert, these nephews would not have conceived the foolish idea that they must kill a man in order to designate their newly acquired nobility:

> Et leurs enfans, qui se sont fais Bretteurs
> Pour signaler leur Noblesse nouvelle
> Sots comme oysons, ont mis dans leur cervelle
> Qu'il leur falloit, à coups de pistolet,
> Tuer un brave, & je voy qu'ils l'ont fait. (Epistres, II, 33)

As indicated by this and other epistles, Boisrobert's relatives were often an emotional as well as financial burden upon the abbot. The bitterness he expresses here towards his brothers and nephews is in every means justified. Boisrobert complains that a senseless murder committed by his nephews, has cost him time, money, and health:

> Car, consumé de chagrin & d'ennuy,
> Je sens encore ma bourse consumée,
> Ce qui sur tout rend ma bile enflammée.
> . . . . . .
> Je me ruyne en informations,
> Je me ruyne en Sergens, en voyages,
> En gros verbaux de cent cinquante pages. (Epistres, II, 34)

The harangue located towards the beginning of the epistle in which Boisrobert damns his brothers and nephews is thus both clarified and justified retrospectively:

Pour mes pechez, Dieu m'a donné des freres
Et des neveux, dont je suis accablé;
. . . . . .
S'ils estoient morts je vivrois trop heureux,
Car je n'ay peine au monde que pour eux;
Mais ne crains pas que le Ciel m'en delivre:
Pour mes pechez il veut les laisser vivre. (Epistres, II, 28-29)

The parents of Boisrobert's three nephews remain unidentified. Tallemant explicitly states in the Historiettes that these nephews were not d'Ouville's sons. The two sons of Boisrobert's and d'Ouville's sister, Charlotte le Métel, held respectable positions in the State, one as a canon in the Church; the other, as a soldier, and were not the nephews in question. The three nephews responsible for the murder, Jacques le Métel, seigneur de Boisrobert, Jean le Vaillant, seigneur de Plémont, et Georges de Douville, were thus sons of other unnamed brothers or sisters.

D'Ouville. Little biographical information is available on Boisrobert's less famous brother, Antoine le Métel, sieur d'Ouville. In the Historiettes Tallemant states that d'Ouville spent thirteen days to write a play, that Boisrobert touched it up a bit, got all he could from the actors, and then took the greater portion for himself. Tallemant goes on to say of d'Ouville: "Il sçavoit la geographie le plus exactement du monde, et avoit une memoire prodigieuse. Il s'estoit marié autrefois en Espagne: Boisrobert fit rompre le mariage." (Tallemant, I, 409-410) In the "Epistre dédicatoire" of d'Ouville's Les Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires, the author informs his patroness, Mademoiselle de Mancini, that he lived in Rome for fourteen years and that he has studied foreign languages for forty years, in particular

Spanish, "qui m'est aussi naturelle que la Françoise."[5] D'Ouville does not precisely clarify the dates of his Italian sojourn. Based on the information provided in the dedicatory epistle, W. Leiner posits the year 1615 as the beginning of his foreign voyages.[6] F. de Armas independently established the following chronology: "Antoine le Métel spent seven years in Spain from 1615 to 1622 and fourteen years in Italy from 1622 to 1636, returning to Paris at that time to devote himself to literature.[7]

Beginning in 1639 with the Esprit folet, a comedy adapted from La dama duende of Calderón, d'Ouville was to popularize the fashion of adapting Spanish plays into French. Within the next five years, he produced five plays, all based on Spanish models, and the Contes aux heures perdues, published in 1643, include an adaptation of the famous blind-man's episode found in the picaresque novel Lazarillo de Tormes, and a translation of Tirso de Molina's "Los tres maridos burlados."

However successful his literary career may have been, d'Ouville was plagued by financial troubles and was to turn to Boisrobert for aid in obtaining his pension. A contemporary of the brothers, Ménage was to comment: "D'Ouville, dont nous avons les Contes, étoit frère de M. l'Abbé de Boisrobert / Ce frère aussi bien que d'autres de ses parents ne cessèrent point de l'importuner si tôt qu'ils le virent dans la faveur.[8] In the Historiettes, Tallemant states that d'Ouville was a geographer, that he had a prodigious memory, and that he had formerly married in Spain, but Boisrobert had had the marriage annuled. Tallemant also speaks of d'Ouville's financial plight, stating that he was never recompensed for his seven years of service to the comte de

Dognon. (Tallemant, I, 409-410)

Tallemant mentions a perpetual quarrel Boisrobert had with the Secretary of State, Louis Phélippeaux, Seigneur de la Vrillière et de Châteauneuf-sur-Loire, who on more than one occasion attempted to withdraw d'Ouville's pension. (Tallemant, I, 405-407) Boisrobert's efforts to obtain payment of d'Ouville's pension were seemingly endless. When on the point of success, La Vrillière withdrew this pension, a veritable combat resulted. Boisrobert obtained Mazarin's promise that the pension would be paid, and then slandered La Vrillière in a satire: "Le Saint-Esprit, honteux d'estre sur ses espaules, / Pour trois sots comme luy s'envoleroit des Gaules." (Tallemant, I, 406) Alerted of La Vrillière's intended complaint to the cardinal, Boisrobert arrived first at the Palais-Royal, and in the presence of the cardinal, wily justified his satire:

> "Monseigneur," luy dit Boisrobert, "ce n'est point contre M. de la Vrillière que j'ay fait ces vers; j'ay lu des Caracteres de Theophraste, et à son imitation j'ay fait le caractere d'un ministre ridicule." (Tallemant, I, 406)

Just as Boisrobert completed his tale, La Vrillière entered, and complained to the cardinal: "Monseigneur, il m'a vituperé, il m'a jetté une bouteille d'encre sur le visage." "Monsou de la Vrillière, ce n'est point vous," disoit le cardinal, "ce sont des Caratteres [sic] de Theophraste." (Tallemant, I, 406) Although Mazarin did not immediately restore d'Ouville's pension, the abbot's continual presence in his waiting room finally forced the cardinal's consent. (Tallemant, I, 406) Three years later, the issue was to resurface when La Vrillière again attempted to suppress d'Ouville's pension.

Boisrobert threatened to publish his satire, and fearing ridicule, the secretary of state reconsidered.

Epistres en Vers

The Epistres en Vers of Boisrobert were published in two volumes which appeared in 1646 and 1659. These Epistres were not re-edited until the critical edition published in 1921 by Maurice Cauchie. Cauchie maintains that the simple and familiar style of Boisrobert could not have been appealing to the exaggerated affections of the age in which they appeared. Literature at this time had place for only: "héroisme invraisemblable, politesse dégénérée en préciosité, éloquence emphatique, burlesque grimaçant." (Epistres, I, iii) Cauchie contends that the desirability of their publication today is that they constitute: "un ensemble unique d'épîtres familières et enjouées, qui, mieux qu'aucune oeuvre de la même époque, représentent l'esprit français." (Epistres, I, iv) Antoine Adam also praises the quality of Boisrobert's poetry and in particular his modernity: "Le poète dont le vocabulaire a le moins vieilli, celui qui parle déjà la langue des précieux, celui qui est le plus près de la langue de Voltaire, ce n'est pas Malherbe, c'est Boisrobert. Langue pure, limpide, un peu molle. Mais souple, extrêmement sensible et élégante."[9]

As the favorite of Richelieu, Boisrobert came in contact with all those of fame, either at court or in the city. The Epistres thus provide a wealth of biographical information on both the author and the age in which he lived. In the "Advis" of the second volume of Epistres, Boisrobert speaks of forty-two years service at the court.

(Epistres, II, 14) The epistles in the present edition of Cauchie span an approximate period of seventeen years (1644-1661), and include a prefatory epistle "Au Sieur Delgade" which had appeared in 1619 in the Cabinet des Muses. The 1646 volume of Epistres is dedicated to the Cardinal Mazarin who besides being minister of the state was at the time: "surintendant de la maison, des affaires et des finances de la reine-mère et chef de son conseil." (Epistres, I, 17) Cauchie's edition of Epistres contain eighty-nine epistles by Boisrobert, only three of which did not appear in the original editions of 1646 and 1659.

In an epistle written in 1646 to Boisrobert, Conrart refers to the Epistres as "lettres galantes," and tells the poet:

> Que ta Poësie excellente
> Est une peinture parlante,
> Car elle nous monstre en effet
> Non la figure de l'objet,
> Mais, en vérité, l'objet mesme. (Epistre, I, 252)

In an epistle written by Boisrobert to the Comtesse de la Suze, the author, feigning shame, reproduces the laudatory lines the countess had written comparing the poet to Horace and praising his easy, natural, and gallant style. (Epistres, II, 255) In the "Advis" of the 1659 edition of Epistres, Boisrobert relates Richelieu's assessment of his talent:

> Il dit, à la vérité, dans les mesmes Vers, que j'ay un talent qui plaist, que j'ay une certaine rencontre qui surprend & qui réjouit, & que par tout où je me montre je fais évanouir la tristesse. Il dit que personne ne sçait mieux que moy l'art de faire sa Cour agreablement, & que j'ay un certain debit en prose, dans les ruelles, qui vaut quelquefois ces Vers naturels qui m'échappent dans le cabinet. (Epistres, II, 13-14)

The immodest poet continues by saying that forty-two years at court have given him the liberty to agree with various complimentary opinions of his work. The author states that he has the reputation of having, in both verse and conversations, "un air enjoué," and "Un tour galand, une certaine aizance / Qu'on peut louer sans trop de complaisance." (Epistres, II, 14) These two verses are from an earlier epistle to Monsieur Conrart, in which he further claims: "En recitant, de vrai, je fay merveilles; / Je suis Conrart, un grand duppeur d'oreilles." (Epistres, I, 245)

French Academy

In the late 1620's, a group of "beaux esprits" began to meet following the initiative of Valentin Conrart. Antoine Adam describes those of this group as purists, highly concerned with the sense of purety of the language. (Adam, I, 223) The formation of the Academy took place in the following manner: Boisrobert learned of the meetings of Conrart's group from one of its members, Nicolas Faret, and asked permission to attend. Charmed by what he saw, Boisrobert spoke of these meetings to Richelieu. Inspired by his favorite to realize the advantages of an association, "composée d'une sélection d'écrivains dévouées dont il dirigerait les pensées et les gestes," (Adam, I, 349) the cardinal gave Boisrobert the responsibility of transmitting to its members his proposition to transform the group into a state sponsored and pensioned organization. One had no choice but to accept Richelieu's protection, and in 1634, the French Academy became an officially recognized society under the cardinal's patronage. Adam

views this patronage as a negative factor in the development of the arts, and states that: "sous les apparences de l'ordre et d'une fausse grandeur, le régime de Richelieu aboutissait à domestiquer les talents, et à rendre stériles les écrivains les plus heureusement doués." (Adam, I, 349)

The authors of the anonymous pamphlet, the Boscorobertine, fail to acknowledge Boisrobert's role in the initial formation of the Academy. They claim ignorance as to the reason for his admittance to this illustrious society, and unjustly attack the abbot as an unworthy member:

> Je ne crois pas que cet abbé mérite, pour sa stupidité, ignorance et impiété, d'en estre du nombre et certe si son talent est de faire le bouffon, c'est une perfection qui n'est à estimer que sur le théâtre. Néanmoins il est de l'Académie françoise. (Magne, p. 428)

The conclusion reached by the pamphleteers is that Boisrobert was admitted to the Academy solely on the cardinal's favor. As E. Magne points out, this paragraph of the Boscorobertine suffices to show the malicious character of this pamphlet which refuses to even recognize the merit of what Magne considers Boisrobert's most important work. (Magne, p. 429)

Boisrobert himself delimits his role of creator and mediator in the French Academy in several epistles in the Epistres en Vers. In 1644 he writes to Monsieur de Bautru: "Lors que, solliciteur des Muses affligées, / J'appliquois tous mes soins à les voir soulagées." (Epistres, I, 46) In the "Advis" of the 1659 edition of the Epistres en Vers, Boisrobert refers to the formation of the French Academy, and the title Richelieu gave him of "ardant Solliciteur des Muses

incommodées." (Epistres, II, 13) He contends that this position yielded him more enemies than friends, but that he prefers the esteem of the cardinal to even that of the "Renommée." (Epistres, II, 13) In an epistle written in 1652 to M^r Lager, Boisrobert reaffirms his favor with Richelieu, and the title bestowed upon him by the cardinal:

> Le grand ARMAND, je le confesse,
> M'a témoigné quelque tendresse;
> Comme il crût voir en mon esprit
> Quelque charme qui le surprit,
> J'en eus des faveurs singulieres
> Aux heures les plus familieres;
> J'en répandis sur maint Autheur,
> Et me fis le Solliciteur
> Des pauvres Muses affligées
> Qu'un dur Siecle avoit negligées;
> Et sa glorieuse amitié,
> Qui fut de ses bien-faits suivie,
> Fait tout l'ornement de ma vie. (Epistres, II, 82)

In an epistle written to the Marquis de Leuville in 1651, Boisrobert affirms his own role and that of the cardinal in the formation of the French Academy. The abbot maintains that he was the creator and promoter and that Richelieu was the protector.

> Et j'eus encore fortune assez amie
> Quand je formay l'Illustre Academie
> Des beaux esprits: j'en fus le Promoteur,
> Et fis qu'Armand s'en fit le Protecteur. (Epistres, II, 155)

Boisrobert was not, however, always pleased with the Academy and its literary production. As earlier mentioned, following the rapid escalation in membership, he satirized this conglomerate, classifying its members according to their passions. He was also critical of the Academy's slowness in following its projected guidelines, and in

particular its tardiness in producing a dictionary, and in 1646, he writes to Balzac:

> L'Academie est comme un vray Chapitre:
> Chacun à part promet d'y faire bien,
> Mais tous ensemble ils ne tiennent plus rien,
> Mais tous ensemble ils ne font rien qui vaille;
> Depuis six ans dessus l'F on travaille,
> Et le Destin m'auroit fort obligé
> S'il m'avoit dit: "Tu vivras jusqu'au G." (Epistres, I, 64)

Boisrobert was undoubtedly influential in creating the French Academy, a fact that modern critics have now acknowledged. The point of view of the Boscorobertine is obviously biased and prejudicial. This anonymous pamphlet does provide valuable insight about both the abbot and his enemies, and is not without a certain truth. The authors' refusal to recognize Boisrobert's role in the formation of the French Academy is malicious and unjustified. Boisrobert played an instrumental role in the creation of the French Academy, and this role suffices to immortalize his name.

Richelieu's Favorite

Boisrobert seems to have been unanimously acclaimed by his contemporaries for the services he rendered as a result of his position as Richelieu's favorite. Tallemant states that he received this title when: "je ne sçay quel provincial desdia un livre à Boisrobert, où il luy donnoit la qualité de 'favory de compagne du Cardinal de Richelieu.'" (Tallemant, II, 397) Tallemant, who is often unjust in his remarks, praises Boisrobert's generosity: "Boisrobert, bien estably chez le cardinal de Richelieu, se mit, car il est officieux, à servir

tous ceux qu'il pouvoit." (Tallemant, II, 396) Tallemant commends Boisrobert's goodness and generosity in an episode involving the dramatist, Mairet. Mairet had previously been associated with the duc de Montmorency, who headed a literary troupe hostile towards those in the service of Richelieu, and as a member of this group, Mairet had scorned Boisrobert's plays. (Tallemant, I, 1059) Totally impoverished, Mairet found himself reduced to the option of starving or asking Chapelain and Conrart for Boisrobert's aid. Boisrobert interceded, and the destitute author was thereby able to obtain a pension from the cardinal: "Le Cardinal luy donna deux cens escus de pension; Boisrobert les porta à M. Conrart: Mairet l'en vint remercier, et se mit à genous devant luy." (Tallemant, I, 397) Tallemant contends that Boisrobert and the cardinal disputed on several occasions about the abbot's overly ardent intercessions for others:

> Il s'est brouillé bien des fois avec le Cardinal pour avoir parlé trop hardiment pour le tiers et pour le quart; mais souvent il disoit au Cardinal tout ce qu'il vouloit, quoyque le Cardinal ne le voulust pas. (Tallemant, I, 398)

In a laudatory epistle prefacing both volumes of the Epistres en Vers, Gombauld writed:

> Sa faveur, bien loin d'estre vaine,
> Fut le recours des affligez,
> Et la Cour est encore pleine
> De ceux qui lui sont obligez. (Epistres, I, 23 and II, 22)

M. Cauchie lists the following among those who benefited from Boisrobert's generosity: the Abbé de Pure, Balzac, Peiresc, Gombauld, Maynard, and Chapelain. (Epistres, I, 23) Cauchie qualifies the ingratitude exhibited by Balzac towards Boisrobert as unjustified

cynicism. (Epistres, I, 23) Upon the appearance of the Epistres, Balzac writes in a letter dated September 24, 1646:

> . . . il faut que je me sois tres mal expliqué sur le sujet du nouveau livre de l'Abbé C[omique]. Je le trouve absolument mauvais, et si mauvais, que je penserois luy faire faveur & mentir de la moitié si je disois:
> Sunt mala sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt bona nulla. O fridiidissimum et insulsissimum scurram! o natum ad servitutem pecus! En effet, comme son Esprit est d'un Poete vulgaire de la vieille Cour, son ame est d'un Esclave confirmé de cette cy . . . . (Epistres, I, 24)

Cauchie explains this unjustified ingratitude on the part of Balzac by the fact that he is not among the three referred to as "grands esprits" by Boisrobert in the first epistle of the 1646 edition of the Epistres en Vers. (Epistres, I, 24) The two men had evidently been on amiable terms earlier in the year, for Boisrobert had addressed the sixth epistle which Cauchie dates around March 25, 1646, to the "Divin Balzac, Prince de l'Eloquence," (Epistres, I, 62) and in relating news of the Academy, Boisrobert tells Balzac: "Ton nom sur tout remplit toute la salle." (Epistres, I, 66) In another epistle written to Mainard in the spring of 1646, Boisrobert praises Balzac whom he calls "l'Oracle de nostre âge." (Epistres, I, 230)

The most malicious injustice committed against Boisrobert is in the form of an anonymous pamphlet, the Boscorobertine, ou Lettre de Florimond à la belle Iris sur l'Abbé ridicule. The unpublished manuscript is reproduced by Emile Magne in the appendix of the Plaisant Abbé de Boisrobert. It is dated August 15, 1677, but was written during Boisrobert's lifetime, thus before 1662. The pamphlet refers to Boisrobert as being more than sixty years old and having spent forty-two years at court. As Boisrobert came to court in 1617, the approximate

date of this pamphlet is 1659. The Boscorobertine is a bitter and condemnatory criticism of Boisrobert, which capitalizes on the abbot's admitted weaknesses. After having viciously attacked the abbot for being among other things, a "barbon," "batteleur," "bouffon," "impie," "goinfre," "goguenard," "cancre," "ivrogne personnage," "poète crotte," and "escroqueur de repas," (Magne, pp. 409-432) the author of this pamphlet hypocritically states that Boisrobert has never given him subject to be his enemy:

> Vous sçavez que ce que je viens de vous escrire est plus tost pour vous faire voir que je suis résolu de vous obéir en tout ce que vous me commanderez que de faire rien qui choquast et me rendit ennemy un homme qui ne m'en a jamais donné de subject. (Magne, p. 442)

The author then concludes by stating that he has not begun to write all the infamous and ridiculous actions of this parasite, "puisqu'il fait plus d'extravagances en une après-dinée que je n'en pourrois escrire en un mois." (Magne, pp. 442-443)

Boisrobert's Morals

Boisrobert seems to have been of frail health, perhaps due to the dissipated life he led. His contemporaries are in agreement in affirming that he was an atheist and libertine, whose favorite pastimes were drinking and gambling.

Gambling. Boisrobert himself admits his propensity for gambling, which was apparently accompanied by periodic bouts of repentance. In an epistle to Rossignol in 1645, Boisrobert condemns this passion:

Malheur sur malheur à qui joue!
Ce seroit peu, je te l'avoue,
Si le jeu, qui m'a gourmandé,
Ne m'avoit pas incommodé.
Le temps, enfin, m'a rendu sage. (Epistres, I, 93)

In another epistle this same year, he again denounces gambling: "Mais malheur à celuy qui joue!" (Epistres, I, 98)

The authors of the Boscorobertine support other contemporary reports that gambling was one of Boisrobert's favorite occupations. "Car, après la promenade et les entretiens galans rien ne luy plaist comme le jeu." (Magne, p. 422) The authors further confirm the abbot's profuse swearing when he was losing: "Il ne peut jouer s'il ne jure; / Gain ou perte sont la mesure / De ses infames juremens," (Magne, p. 423) and refer to the notorious episode which resulted in his banishment from court. Tallemant contends that Boisrobert was unable to abstain from gambling, and that he gambled like a child: "Il ne peut se tenir de jouer, et joue comme un enfant." (Tallemant, II, p. 400) Boisrobert did not lose his inclination for gambling as he grew older, and enormous losses necessitated successive sollicitations to Foucquet and later to Colbert. (Magne, p. 385)

Drinking. If one were to believe the Boscorobertine, vice was so strongly entwined in the abbot that it could only be destroyed by death. (Magne, p. 440) One of the repeated criticisms by the authors of the Boscorobertine is the abbot's excessive drinking:

S'enyvrer puis se bien coucher
Aux despens de son bénéfice,
Luy paroit estre un exercice
Plus doux que celuy de prescher. (Magne, p. 418)

The authors again refer to Boisrobert's debauchery at the expense of his benefice some pages later: "La débauche est son élément / Et la rente du bénéfice / Luy sert icy d'un bon office." (Magne, p. 433) With a definite undertone of aristocratic arrogance, the Boscorobertine violently accuses the abbot of being a glutton. The anonymous pamphlet claims that the nobility is rarely subject to these vices, and further attack the fact that Boisrobert's letters of nobility are brand new. Continuing in the same venomous tone, the pamphlet scorns the abbot's birth, soul, being, and letters of nobility as base: "Enfin chez lui tout est bassesse / Jusqu'à ses lettres de noblesse." (Magne, p. 435)

Homosexuality. Tallemant on several occasions refers to Boisrobert's homosexuality, explicitly stating that: "on l'a accusé d'aimer les pages," (Tallemant, I, 392) or more subtly referring to his "petites complexions." (Tallemant, I, 413) Another allusion to both Boisrobert's homosexuality and libertinage occurs in the form of an anecdote recounted by Tallemant, the subject of which is Boisrobert's alleged Turkish conversion. Tallemant claims to be quoting a man from Nancy who has heard:

> " que Boisrobert s'estoit fait Turc, et que le Grand-Seigneur luy avoit donné de grands revenus avec de beaux petits garçons pour se resjouir, et que, de là, il avoit escrit aux libertins de la Cour: 'Vous autres, messieurs, vous vous amusez à renier Dieu cent fois le jour; je suis plus fin que vous: je ne l'ay renié qu'une, et je m'en trouve fort bien.'" (Tallemant, I, 395)

Tallemant further cites an alleged conversation between Boisrobert and his "divine," Ninon de Lenclos, a libertine whose salon was a shelter

for those of similar philosophy. The following conversation is purported to have taken place when Boisrobert appeared at Ninon's home with a pretty young boy:

> "Mais," luy dit-elle, "ce petit vilain vous vient toujours retrouver. "Ouy," respondit-il, "j'ay beau le mettre en mestier, il revient tousjours. "C'est, reprit-elle, "qu'on ne luy fait nulle part ce que vous luy faittes." (Tallemant, I, 407)

On another occasion, Boisrobert is rumored to have said that Ninon had written to him speaking of the good treatment that she was receiving from the Madelonnettes, a convent in which the Devots had had her emprisoned in 1657. Ninon is purported to have told Boisrobert: "'Je pense qu'à vostre imitation, je commenceray à aimer mon sexe.'" (Tallemant, I, 413) Tallemant relates another incident in which upon seeing Boisrobert saying midnight mass, a certain M^me^ Cornuel remarked: "'Voilà toute ma devotion esvanouye.'" (Tallemant, I, 412) According to Tallemant, Boisrobert later wrote an unpublished sonnet against M^me^ Cornuel, in which he played upon the word Cornuel.

In 1646, shortly before Boisrobert's first volume of Epistres was published, a satire by Gilles Ménage entitled Requeste des dictionnaires à Messieurs de l'Académie françoise, began to circulate in Paris. In this satire, Ménage criticizes the Academy among other things for feminizing a number of words and herein alludes to Boisrobert's intimate relationships with his lackeys. The two reconciled their differences immediately before the appearance of the Epistres, which contain two Latin verses by Ménage as a symbol of this reconciliation. (Epistres, I, 20-21)

The authors of the Boscorobertine appear unaware of Boisrobert's

sexual inclination, and on the contrary refer to his success "parmi les coquettes," (Magne, p. 431) and to his interest in the female sex: "Si son cloistre enfermoit quelques religieuses / On l'y verroit assez souvent." (Magne, p. 418) Criticizing his licentious life, the pamphlet portrays the abbot dressed in gray, accompanied by his ruffian, sneaking to the home of his "femme de joye." (Magne, p. 438)

Libertinage. Boisrobert's lack of theological responsibility is violently attacked in the Boscorobertine. The anonymous authors pose a question concerning the abbot's theological inclination:

> Quelle estoit son intention
> Lorsqu'il prit party dans l'Eglise
> Ou bien d'embrasser la prestrise,
> Ou d'ayder son ambition? (Magne, p. 414)

The response to this question is undisputed. Boisrobert's ecclesiastical benefits were acquired, as Emile Magne maintains, without his having shown proof of the slightest theological virtue:

> Car si Boisrobert envisage avec satisfaction l'importance de la prébende qui lui advient sans avoir fait preuve de la moindre vertu théologale, il ne se montre pas disposé à changer d'existence. (Magne, p. 173)

Boisrobert's religious inclinations were without doubt financially motivated. His actions are not, however, as reprehensible as first appearances might indicate. The practice of receiving ecclesiastical benefices was quite common at this time, and did not automatically necessitate religious devotion. Boisrobert was thus in a sense commendable in the lack of hypocrisy he expressed by openly confessing his deficient devotion, as can be seen by an epistle in which he cri-

ticizes Monsieur Dupin for having said that he was devout: "Tu n'as pas menty par ta gorge / Mais par ta main, en ce seul mot / Où tu m'as traitté de devot." (Epistres, I, 186) In effect, the Boscorobertine confirms, though certainly without praise, Boisrobert's lack of hypocrisy concerning his devotion: "Iris, je l'en estime davantage en ce qu'il n'est poinct hypocrite, car s'il joignoit ce vice à tous les autres auxquels il est sujet, il seroit beaucoup plus dangereux. (Magne, p. 516) The judgment of the authors of the Boscorobertine, that: "l'intention des fondateurs de ces bénéfices . . . n'estoit pas pour les donner à un goinfre pour les dissiper et pour l'entretenir dans ses desbauches," (Magne, p. 414) is prejudicially critical of the abbot's personal vices, and a bit severe in view of current practices regarding ecclesiastical benefices.

Another incident which confirms Boisrobert's lack of religious belief is a conversation recounted by Tallemant which involves M^me^ Sauvoy and Boisrobert: "' Vous passez partout,' luy dit-elle, 'pour un impie, pour un athée.'" The abbot replied that one must not believe everything that one hears, and that: "'on m'a dit, à moy, que vous estiez la plus grande garce du mond.'" (Tallemant, I, 407) Tallemant further mentions an episode in which the devout of the court had Boisrobert exiled as one who ate meat during Lent, who had no religion, who swore horribly when gambling, and adds Tallemant: "cela est vray." (Tallemant, I, 412)

Boisrobert frequented a libertine society which included Théophile de Viau and Saint-Amant. All three were Catholic converts of Protestant origin, and all were libertines and atheists, a fact substantiated by contemporary documents. Emile Magne maintains that Boisrobert's

libertinage as well as his good humor were a hindrance to the abbot. The devout patiently awaited vengeance, and when Boisrobert was no longer the court favorite, they unleashed their triumphant hatred. Magne's contention is that Boisrobert's principal error was not to have abandoned a society by which he had been rejected. (Magne, p. 392)

Humor. Tallemant praises Boisrobert's talents as a comedian in the Historiettes where he states: "On ne sçauroit faire plus plaisamment un conte qu'il le fait; il n'y a pas un meilleur comédien au monde." (Tallemant, I, 400) In the preface of the first volume of Epistres, Mascaron speaks of Boisrobert as being of excellent nature and delicate taste. He refers to Boisrobert's "adresse" and "douceur" in almost the same terms as does the Abbé de Pure, who states in La Pretieuse: "Il raille de si bonne grace, il picque si doucement, enfin il est si agreablement censeur & severe, que je lui pardonnerois quasi quand je m'en verrois mal traittée." (Epistres, I, 32) In the Historiettes, Tallemant relates an episode in which Boisrobert's finesse as a comedian earned him the pardon of the Jesuit fathers. Upon leaving their assemblage, one of the fathers is said to have told Boisrobert: "'Monsieur, venez nous voir quelquefois, il n'y a personne qui rejouisse tant les Pères que vous.'" (Tallemant, I, 408)

Antoine Adam states that in his later years, Boisrobert reigned in certain salons due to his talent for telling tales and his rare acquaintance with scandalous chronicle. The abbot became even more the poet of the salons:

> L'opinion le considérait comme "le directeur du royaume de

> coquetterie," et ses ennemis l'appelaient "le grand prestre des coquettes." Ils s'amusaient à le décrire, trônant dans les ruelles, s'érigeant en philosophe galant, tout occupé à "dogmatiser dans les fauteuils" et à "argumenter sur l'amour." On sentait ce vieil homme gagné à la nouvelle galanterie. (Adam, II, 63)

These enemies Adam refers to are the authors of the anonymous pamphlet the Boscorobertine. Referring to the abbot as the high priest and director of the coquettes, the pamphlet further states: "Vous le voyez dans leurs ruelles où il tient son throsne s'ériger en philosophe galand." (Magne, p. 412)

The Boscorobertine states that Richelieu "treuvent dans nostre personnage une certaine humeur bouffone capable de le faire rire dans sa plus grande tristesse . . . ." (Magne, p. 410) Boisrobert's comic ability is one of the arguments presented in the Boscorobertine to illustrate that the abbot lacks theological capability. The anonymous authors claim that one whose purpose is to amuse can not conversely produce tears by his devout sermons: "Celuy qui n'a pour but que de nous faire rire / Ne nous peut, quoy qu'il puisse dire, / Faire verser des pleurs dans ses dévôts sermons." (Magne, p. 417) The authors further maintain that Boisrobert has not read a single chapter of the Bible because it is not humorous: "Ce sainct livre lui a dépleu / Parce qu'il n'estoit pas risible." (Magne, p. 417)

Boisrobert's relationship with Richelieu

The relationship of Boisrobert and Richelieu can be traced to the year 1627 when in the Recueil des plus beaux vers, Boisrobert addressed himself to the cardinal in order to ask for the good will of the king.

Antoine Adam states that shortly after this date, Boisrobert belonged entirely to the prime minister, and that in 1633 and 1634, this favor made him an extremely important personage. (Adam, I, 216) Boisrobert's success with Richelieu can be attributed to two primary causes: his ability to keep the minister amused and the variety of services he performed.

The task of amusing an imperious and irritable master was not an easy thing, and on several occasions Boisrobert suffered a temporary disgrace. (Adam, I, 217) Richelieu conveyed to Boisrobert the task of guarding the fate of literature in the regime, and the poet became in Magne's words, "une sorte de dieu tutélaire des lettres." (Magne, p. 391) Adam contends that Boisrobert's official position with Richelieu unfortunately stifled the author's personal poetry, and the new pieces published in 1630 were almost totally devoted to the praise of the king and the cardinal. (Adam, I, 349) A similar suppression of confidentiality in Boisrobert's poetry occurred in later years when he was named conseiller d'Etat by Séguier. The greater portion of his verse was then consecrated to the praise of the chancellor. Magne contends that Boisrobert wrote little useless praise, or at least did not persist in writing praise that bore no fruit. It was necessary that each of the poet's laudatory epistles had a material reward. (Magne, p. 331)

Critics and Contemporaries. Of the eighty-nine epistles comprising Boisrobert's Epistres en Vers, the "Advis" of the second volume and some twenty epistles scattered throughout the two volumes contain references to Boisrobert's past glory under Richelieu, contrasted with

the misery of his present situation with the cardinal's successor, Mazarin.

Tallemant, a contemporary of Boisrobert, is not always supportive of the glorified vision of the abbot's life at court when Richelieu was alive. In the Historiettes, he writes that the Cardinal Richelieu: "ne le goustoit point, et plusieurs fois il gronda ses gens de ne pas desfaire de cet homme." (Tallemant, I, 393) Tallemant further states that in order to subsist at court, Boisrobert resorted to subtle ruses, and as exemplification, he recounts an episode in which Boisrobert sold the court books its nobility had given him in order to establish a library. Tallemant claims that this episode reappears in the Francion under the guise of a musician who demanded tools for the alleged purpose of constructing a collection of musical instruments. (Tallemant, I, 393) Although decidedly an amusing tale, no evidence exists to prove that this anecdote in the Historiettes was anything more than just that.

As concerns the relationship of Boisrobert and Richelieu, certain tales recounted by Tallemant reveal that the cardinal took a certain malicious pleasure in his favorite's mischievous wit, as on one occasion, when outwitted by Boisrobert, the cardinal is purported to have said: "'Ce vilain,' disoit le Cardinal, 'me dira tout, sans que je m'en puisse fascher.'" (Tallemant, I, 399) Célestin Hippeau maintains that soon after being presented to Richelieu, Boisrobert's favor escalated to such a point that he became absolutely essential to the cardinal. Hippeau speculates that the gravity of ministering the country required the counterbalance Boisrobert's gaiety, spirit, and malice provided:

> Il lui fallait des courtisans qui, comme Boisrobert, toujours en fond de gaîté, d'esprit et de malice, pussent dissiper par leur seule présence la profonde mélancolie, qui est le partage de ceux que l'ambition condamne au triste honneur de gouverner les hommes.[10]

The infamous tale of Boisrobert's disgrace is recounted in the following manner by Tallemant in the Historiettes: At the rehearsal of a comedy staged by the cardinal, Boisrobert, who had been ordered to admit only the actors and authors, allowed Saint-Amour, a former actress of questionable morals, to enter. A few days later, when the play opened, M. d'Orléans complained to both king and cardinal of this person's presence at the rehearsal, referring to her as: "une des plus grandes gourgandines de Paris." (Tallemant, I, 401) Accused by his enemies of being responsible for Saint-Amour's entrance, Boisrobert's pleas of innocence were in vain: "Boisrobert pleura, fit toutes les protestations imaginables; mais le Cardinal, à qui ce que le Roy avoit dit tenoit furieusement au coeur, luy dit: 'Vous avez scandalizé le Roy, retirez-vous.'" (Tallemant, I, 402) Boisrobert was thus ordered to leave the court, and he retired to Rouen where he was to remain in disgrace for twenty months.

A letter by Chapelain reproduced in the Histoire du Théâtre françois of the Parfaict brothers, and cited by Adam in the "Notes" of the Historiettes, further clarifies this event dating from the 1641 première of Mirame. In this letter it is a question of two women of questionable reputation whom Boisrobert admits to the opening performance:

> Quand la tragédie de Mirame fut jouée pour la première fois, le Cardinal fit défendre d'y laisser entrer qui que ce fût, hors les personnes qu'il auroit nommées lui-même. Bois-

> robert cependant ne laissa pas d'y laisser entrer secrètement deux femmes d'une réputation équivoque. La duchesse d'Aiguillon, qui ne l'aimoit point, comme ordinairement les parents des Grands n'aiment point leurs favoris, profita de cette occasion pour le perdre, en remontrant au cardinal que Boisrobert étoit le seul qui eût osé mépriser ses ordres, et qu'à la vue de la Reine et de toute la Cour, il avoit été le profanateur de son palais. (Tallemant, I, 1061)

Emile Magne contends that Boisrobert was the victim of a cabal organized by Cinq-Mars, Saint-Georges, and Appellevoisin:

> Cinq-Mars dont il refusa de servir la conjuration débutants; Saint-Georges et Appellevoisin, capitaine et enseigne des gardes cardinalices, dont il dévoila les malhonnêtes tripotages, unissant leurs rancunes, provoquèrent son exil en exploitant, auprès de Louis XIII, les turpitudes de ses moeurs. (Magne, p. 274)

Boisrobert confirms his suspicion of the Marquis de Cinq-Mars's responsibility for his disgrace in a letter cited by Emile Magne, dated June 25, 1642 to R. P. Faure:

> "'A ce changement d'affaire, j'espère mon restablissement plus que jamais puisque celuy qui m'avoit perdu auprès du Roy est maintenant dans l'accablement où il m'avoit mis par sa calomnie . . . .'" (Magne, p. 282)

Cinq-Mars was decapitated in Lyon on September 12, 1642, having been found guilty of conspiracy against the king.

In spite of Boisrobert's disgrace resulting in his banishment from court by Richelieu from January 23, 1641 until November 16, 1642, only eighteen days before Richelieu's death, the two men appear to have sincerely enjoyed a friendship that had lasted some twenty years. Emile Magne maintains that Richelieu always considered Boisrobert as a frivolous, but faithful, friend. (Magne, p. 391)

The favor Boisrobert enjoyed with Richelieu was not to continue with the ascent of Mazarin, although ironically it was Mazarin who was responsible for Boisrobert's return to court and his reconciliation with Richelieu. (Tallemant, I, 404) M. Cauchie postulates that this disfavor perhaps resulted from the antipathy of the regent queen to all that recalled Richelieu, or that perhaps, as Boisrobert indicates, Mazarin took offense at Boisrobert's voluntary withdrawal to the provinces after Richelieu's death. (Epistres, I, 48)

Boisrobert's Commentary. In an epistle written in October 1644 to Monsieur de Bautru, Boisrobert laments his present state. Upon returning to court, he has discovered that doors once open are now closed, and he begs his friend: "De grace, introduy-moy dans ce sacré Palais." (Epistres, I, 51) From his residence in Normandy, Boisrobert confesses that he is unable to forget the court and in an epistle to Rossignol in 1645, Boisrobert mourns his own loss at the death of Richelieu.

> Il est mort, cet homme adorable
> Qui nous estoit si favorable;
> Et par ce funeste accident
> J'ay perdu tout en le perdant. (Epistres, I, 84)

In this same epistle, Boisrobert speaks of his past favor, again bemoaning the fact that:"J'ay de cette maison sacrée / Perdu la favorable entrée." (Epistres, I, 86) He continues to profess admiration and love for the new cardinal, and seems genuinely perplexed at the poor reception accorded him: "Mais j'aime cet homme charmant / Et cherche à le voir seulement." (Epistres, I, 87) Boisrobert rejoices upon finally being received by Mazarin, and compares his

present favor to that he enjoyed before Richelieu's death:

> Me voyant si fort honoré,
> Certes je me consideré,
> Dans cette faveur éclatante,
> Tout tel qu'en l'an six cens quarante; (Epistres, I, 90)

In an epistle of September 1645, Boisrobert refers to his love of the court as a "mal de Cour," (Epistres, I, 116) that he has nourished for thirty years. He speaks of Fontainebleau as being the most beautiful place in the world, but a place where one can know neither liberty nor repose. In an effort to resist the temptations of the court, he thus rationalizes that nothing equals his little corner in Normandy, where he someday wants to live at rest and laugh at past vanities:

> C'est là que je veux, à plaisir,
> Dedans un honneste loisir,
> Rire des vanitez passees
> Qui s'offriront à mes pensées; (Epistres, I, 118)

And on this future day, when he will contentedly live in solitude:

> Je diray, d'un ton de mespris:
> Adieu, le Louvre! Adieu, Paris!
> Adieu, folles & vaines pompes!
> Adieu, faux éclat qui nous trompes! (Epistres, I, 119)

In an epistle written in August or September of 1645, Boisrobert reminisces about the glory that was his when Richelieu was alive. Remembrances of this past serve now, however, only to heighten his present distress:

> Helas! ce doux temps est passé,
> Et je ne pense à cette gloire
> Que pour affliger ma memoire
> De ce doux bien que j'ay perdu
> Parce qu'il ne m'estoit pas deu. (Epistres, I, 190-191)

He accuses only himself for his fall from favor, but paradoxically attributes his misfortune to his goodness in pressuring the cardinal on behalf of his friends:

> Qu'on n'en doit accuser que moy:
> Ma bonté m'a fait miserable;
> J'ay pressé cet homme adorable;
> Le desordre où je me suis mis
> Pour l'interest de mes amis
> A fait cet accident sinistre
> Et rebuté ce grand Ministre. (Epistres, I, 191)

As in previous epistles, Boisrobert stresses that he renounces all material favors and wishes only to be warmly received by Mazarin. (Epistres, I, 193) In an epistle written the spring of 1646, Boisrobert relays to Mazarin the difficulties he has undergone just in order to catch a glimpse of him. He pleads that his motivation, unlike that of others, is without self-interest or ambition, and will cost the cardinal nothing. He once again expresses his bewilderment that he who was once so favored at court, is now greeted with closed doors:

> Enfin, confus d'être si malheureux,
> Et rebuté d'un sort si rigoureux
> Quoy qu'il soit juste, ô grand & sage Prince,
> Je sors d'ici, je fuy dans ma Province; (Epistres, I, 130)

Boisrobert extols the merits of Paris in an epistle written in 1646 to Monsieur Esprit:

> Ce lieu Divin, ce lieu délicieux,
> Ce Paradis des ames & des yeux,
> Cet Abrégé des Miracles du Monde,
> Ce grand Paris, enfin, où tout abonde. (Epistres, I, 222)

In an epistle written from his priory in Ferté-sur-Aube to Monsieur

de Caradas later this same year, Boisrobert again lauds his beloved Paris: "Ce doux Paris, ce Paris adorable, / Ce seul sejour de l'homme raisonnable." (Epistres, I, 241) Criticizing the provincial home whose financial obligations necessitate his presence, he attempts to reconcile himself to his self-imposed exile: "Puisque Paris, pour qui je meurs d'envie, / Ne me peut pas d'un an donner la vie. . . . / Il faut par force aller vivre en Champagne." (Epistres, I, 241-242)

In the second volume of Epistres, published in 1659, thirteen years after the appearance of volume I, Boisrobert's position at court has stabilized and his interpretation of Mazarin's attitude has mellowed: "Si je n'ay point receu de bienfaits de ce grand Homme qui m'a toûjours honoré d'une si particuliere bien-veillance & qui a si dignement succedé à mon bienfaicteur, c'est que je ne luy ay jamais rien demandé ny en prose ny en vers, que l'honneur d'estre quelquefois souffert en sa présence." (Epistres, II, 15)

References to Boisrobert's former favor with Richelieu, the loss of this favor with the ascent of Mazarin, his love of court and Paris, and his displeasure with provincial life, are scattered throughout the second volume of Epistres. Indeed, the abbot continues to glorify the years spent as Richelieu's favorite in epistles written as late as 1658, some sixteen years after the cardinal's death. The aging abbot was never able to accept what he considered an unjustified fall from favor. Having once tasted glory as court favorite, he was to spend the remainder of his days in an effort to recapture its savor. The second volume of Epistres is thus an even more valuable source of biographical and psychological data on Boisrobert than the first, for it is testimony of the extent of Boisrobert's obsession with favor

at court, and his unwillingness to ever accept its loss.

In the first epistle of Volume II, written to Mazarin, Boisrobert alludes to his former favor when Richelieu was cardinal. He complains that whereas at court one suffers the presence of the powerless, in the provinces, he who no longer has power is despised. The once regaled abbot is thus now disdained by the jealous provincials. Maintaining that his situation is not as ruinous as these people have imagined, Boisrobert refers to Mazarin's love for him, and humorously speaks of his own vanity when allowed a glimpse of the cardinal from his waiting room. He states that on one occasion, he had been seen there by several Normands. These provincials were fooled by appearances, and assuming the cardinal had asked him there, they later showered the abbot with compliments. Boisrobert thus suggests that the two of them could dupe these men of the provinces, if the cardinal would just pretend to speak to him when passing near. (Epistres, II, 24-27)

In an epistle written in 1647 or 1648 to the abbé de Richelieu, grandnephew of the Cardinal Richelieu, Boisrobert expresses his agony upon returning to the Parisian gardens and fountains:

> Ce Parc, qui fut mon element
> Quand je vivois auprès d'Armand,
> Rappella dedans ma pensée
> L'estat de ma gloire passée. (Epistres, II, 59)

In an epistle written in 1652 to M^r^ Lager, Boisrobert refers to the favor he shared when Richelieu, the great Armand, was cardinal:

> Le grand Armand, je le confesse,
> M'a témoigné quelque tendresse;
> Comme il crût voir en mon esprit

Quelque charme qui le surprit,
J'en eus des faveurs singulieres
Aux heures les plus familieres. (Epistres, II, 82)

In 1656, Boisrobert writes to the abbé Foucquet to lament his past glory and the injustice of his present banishment from favor. Maintaining that he has innocently fallen into disgrace, he appeals to Foucquet to grant a pension to his brother d'Ouville, who: "n'a plus d'autre ressource / Que celle qu'il trouve en ma bourse." (Epistres, II, 169) In 1655, the abbot again writes of his "estat brillant" under the great Armand, a period which for Boisrobert was "doux" and "heureux." (Epistres, II, 191) Again in 1657, Boisrobert writes of the favorable opinion Richelieu held of his favorite:

Le Grand Armand, cét Homme incomparable,
Crut avant vous que j'estois agreable;
Ce grand Esprit, au doux regne passé,
Par mes discours s'est souvent délassé. (Epistres, II, 221)

The last and longest reference in the Epistres en Vers to Richelieu, to Boisrobert's past glory and to his present disgrace, is an epistle written in 1658 to Monsieur de Lyonne. The entire epistle is a bitter lamentation on the capriciousness of life at court, and a recapitulation of events surrounding the rise and fall of Boisrobert's favor. The abbot writes of his sadness upon losing Richelieu:

Depuis que le plus grand des hommes
S'éclipsa du Siècle où nous sommes
(Tu vois que je marque en ce lieu
L'Incomparable RICHELIEU),
Toute la Cour, je le confesse,
Me fut un Objet de tristesse:
J'avois peine à porter les yeux
Sur ces endroits delicieux,
Témoins de ma gloire passée
Qu'avec luy je vis éclipsée; (Epistres, II, 266)

Following Richelieu's death, Boisrobert writes that he was initially content with Mazarin's ensuing power. His former favor was not, however, to continue with the new cardinal, and being refused entrance to his chambers, the abbot states that he fled to the country where he initially hoped to live in innocence and peace:

> Dés que j'eus perdu mes Entrées,
> Je me sauvay dans des Contrées
> Où je vy, selon mes souhaits,
> Regner l'innocence & la paix. (Epistres, II, 267)

Quickly bored by the pleasures this life had to offer, Boisrobert was soon persuaded by friends to return to court. Emphasizing the inaccessibility of the new cardinal, Boisrobert states that for more than a year he tried without success to see Mazarin:

> Ce grand Homme est inaccessible,
> Et, quand il veut estre visible,
> Il faut bien estre aymé de Dieu
> Pour sçavoir & l'heure & le lieu.
> Pour voir ma peine terminée,
> Je m'obstiné plus d'une année
> A voir si j'aurois son accés,
> Et ce fut toujours sans succés. (Epistres, II, 268-269)

Once Boisrobert's position with Mazarin became apparent, the abbot's enemies and misfortunes grew in number, resulting in his disgrace and banishment from court. The abbot bitterly criticizes the flux and reflux of favor at court and concludes that the pain is always more certain than the pleasure:

> On y coule de doux momens,
> Mais qui, sujets aux changements,
> Laissent, à qui se les propose,
> Le repentir pour toute chose.
> Je me suis veu priseé, chery;
> J'ay passé pour le favory

Du plus grand Homme de la Terre;
Mais on m'a cassé comme un verre
Dés que j'ay perdu son appuy;
Et tel, qu'on adore aujourd'huy,
Sera demain par avanture
En aussi mauvaise posture. (Epistres, II, 271)

The present epoch is "un temps barbare & maudit" (Epistres, II, 274) for the abbot, and he writes that he has warned his friends no longer to expect from him the joyous spirit that was once their pleasure. Boisrobert concludes the epistle by expressing his gratitude to Monsieur de Lyonne for having assisted him in seeing Mazarin. The abbot claims that he vies for nothing but the friendship of the cardinal and of Lyonne:

Pour achever de vivre heureux,
Pour éluder les artifices,
Pour braver les mauvais offices,
Et pour rire au nez des flatteurs,
Des Cagots & des Delatteurs. (Epistres, II, 276)

Disgrace. The disgrace and banishment from court that Boisrobert refers to in the preceding epistle occurred in June 1655. Boisrobert's inability to abstain from swearing in the presence of Mazarin's nieces while gambling, resulted in the abbot's second and more humiliating disgrace. Although allowed to return to Paris after only six months, the exile from court, which had been demanded by the king's Jesuit confessor, R. P. Annat, was to last until February 1658, a duration of almost three years. Immediately preceding this event, Boisrobert had regained much of his earlier favor, and the timing was unfortunate for the aging abbot. Gambling counted among his most grievous misfortunes, and unable to control the rage incited by a continual losing streak, he blasphemed the name of God. Mazarin and his

nieces would have probably pardoned Boisrobert, but R. P. Annat had long disapproved the abbot's conduct. Guarding the respectability of the court, he thus denounced the blasphemer, and the king ordered Boisrobert to leave the court immediately.

In an epistle written in 1655, Boisrobert thanks the sister of Cardinal Mazarin, Madame de Mancini, for obtaining permission for him to return to Paris:

> Je vous doy tout, & l'honneur & la vie,
> Car le chagrin me l'eust-il pas ravie
> Si mon retour, par vos soins procuré,
> Jusqu'en Décembre eust esté differé? (Epistres, II, 239)

He still remains banished from the presence of the queen and king, from whom he awaits his glory and the end of his suffering, and thus lamenting his imperfect pleasure, he begs Madame de Mancini to appease the queen's wrath:

> Toute la Cour me revoit avec joye;
> Mais la Cour veut que la Reyne me voye,
> Et mes plaisirs demeurent imparfaits
> Si je ne voy l'effet de leurs souhaits.
> J'attens ma gloire & la fin de ma peine
> Des jeux divins de cette Auguste Reyne,
> Et j'auray fait des voeux bien superflus
> Pour mon retour si je ne la voy plus. (Epistres, II, 239)

In his latter years, Boisrobert was never to regain the favor at court he had earlier enjoyed with Richelieu. On the other hand, his influence on the theater was to become more considerable as his theatrical production increased in volume. He took great interest in the staging of his plays and in his role as a coquet à la mode, as the following depiction by the Boscorobertine illustrates:

Il a trop d'ambition
Et trop d'humeur acariatre
Pour n'estre pas sur le théatre
A sa représentation.
Ce jour notre illustre poète
A le bas fièrement plissé;
Son collet luyt d'estre lissé
Et mesme il a la barbe faitte.
Ses souliers sont de maroquin
Ombragez d'une large rose
Et sur ses bas unys repose
Négligemment un brodequin. (Magne, p. 424)

At the age of sixty-six, Boisrobert is depicted by Antoine Adam as the most notorious example of the coquet, continuing to show the same "souplesse" of character as in the days of Richelieu. He was attached to the chancellor, Séguier, whom he incessantly praises in the Epistres en Vers, and by whom he had been named conseiller d'Etat. He was titulary abbot of Châtillon-sur-Seine, Nozay, and Ferté-sur-Aube. (Adam, II, 60) Under the protection of Séguier, Boisrobert had no recourse but to defend resolutely the cause of Mazarin against that of the Frondeurs. The abbot's position vis-à-vis the Frondeurs is criticized by Tallemant in the Historiettes: "Boisrobert, tousjours bon courtisan, s'avisa de faire des vers contre les Frondeurs; il n'y eut jamais un homme plus lasche." (Tallemant, I, 408) Boisrobert himself commends his loyalty to the regime in an epistle to Madame de Mancini in 1655:

J'ayme le Roy; je l'ay bien fait parestre:
Tout Paris sçait que pour ce digne Maistre,
Qu'on peut nommer la merveille des Roys,
J'ay hazardé ma vie assez de fois;
Que pour la Reyne, en attaquant la fronde,
J'ay couru risque aux yeux de tout le monde. (Epistres, II, 240)

Death. Tallemant portrays the dying abbot as avaricious, questionably repentant, and ever reluctant to relinquish his inherent buffoonery:

> Comme son confesseur luy disoit que Dieu avoit pardonné à de plus grands pecheurs que luy: "Ouy, mon père, il y en a de plus grands; l'abbé de Villarseaux, mon hoste (il luy en vouloit, parce qu'il avoit perdu son argent contre luy), est sans doute plus grand pecheur que moy, cependant je ne desespere pas que Dieu ne luy fasse misericorde." (Tallemant, I, 416)

According to Tallemant, the abbot's last words are remembrances of the time when Richelieu, now dead for almost twenty years, was cardinal:

> Il disoit: "Je me contenterois d'estre aussy bien avec Nostre-Seigneur, que j'ay esté avec le cardinal de Richelieu."
>
> Comme il tenoit le Crucifix, et qu'il demandoit pardon à Dieu: "Ah! ce dit-il, au diable soit ce vilain potage que j'ay mangé chez d'Olonne; il y avoit de l'oignon, c'est ce qui m'a fait mal." Et puis il reprenoit: "Le cardinal de Richelieu m'a gasté; il ne valloit rien, c'est luy qui m'a perverty." (Tallemant, I, 417)

Although of questionable validity, the recounting of Boisrobert's death by Tallemant serves to illustrate the degree of contemporary awareness of the abbot's incessant and enduring obsession with a former age when he was Richelieu's favorite. After the cardinal's death, Boisrobert was never again to experience this favor, and distressed by reoccurring rejections and denials, his recourse was to glorify those moments he could never recapture.

Notes

[1] Tallemant des Réaux, Historiettes, ed. Antoine Adam (Dijon: Gallimard, 1960), I, 1054.

[2] Louis Batiffol, Le Siècle de la Renaissance (Paris: Hachette, [1936]), p. 290.

[3] Maurice Cauchie, ed., Epistres en Vers (Paris: Hachette, 1921), II, 301.

[4] Emile Magne, Le Plaisant Abbé de Boisrobert (Paris: Mercure de France, 1909), pp. 447-451.

[5] Antoine Le Métel, Sieur d'Ouville, "Epistre dédicatoire," Les Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires (Paris: Luynes, 1656), n. p.

[6] W. Leiner, Widmungsbrief in der französischen Literatur, 1580-1715 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1965), p. 285.

[7] Frederick A. de Armas, "Antoine Le Métel, Sieur d'Ouville: the 'Lost' years," Romance Notes (vol. XIV, no. 3, 1973), p. 543.

[8] James Wilson Coke, "Antoine Le Métel, Sieur d'Ouville: His Life and his Theatre." Diss. Indiana University 1958, p. 29.

[9] Antoine Adam, Histoire de la Littérature française au XVII^{e} Siècle (Paris: Domat, 1947-1956), I, 90.

[10] Célestin Hippeau, Les Ecrivains normands au XVII^{e} Siècle (Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970. Rpt. Caen: 1786), p. 104.

Chapter 2

NOVELLA, NOVELA, NOUVELLE

The purpose of the present chapter is to situate the historical climate at the time Boisrobert's Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses were published, to define this genre, and to briefly trace its origins.

The nouvelle had a native provenance in the medieval fabliaux and fables, but its more direct source was the fourteenth century collection of tales by Boccaccio: the Decameron. Marguerite de Navarre's Heptaméron, which first appeared in 1558, is modeled on the Decameron and initially bore the same title. Although the Heptaméron is innovative in certain respects, it is Cervantes' Novelas ejemplares, first published in 1613 and translated into French in 1615 which mark a new era for this genre. The Novelas ejemplares were extremely popular and led to the proliferation in Spain of other novelas by such authors as María de Zayas, Tirso de Molina, Pérez de Montalbán, and Castillo Solórzano. These novelas were in turn translated or adapted into French, and Boisrobert was one of many authors involved in this movement. The direct sources utilized by Boisrobert in composing the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses were: Rotrou (indirectly Lope), Tirso de Molina, María de Zayas, and Calderón de la Barca. Of these authors, only Zayas' "La perseguida triunfante" is a novela; the other sources are plays. A commentary on the reproduction of nouvelles

from both novelas and comedias and a brief biographical sketch of those who served as Boisrobert's sources will also be provided in this chapter.

Historical Climate

Spain's greatest literary as well as social impact on French society occupied a span of approximately thirty years in the early seventeenth century. G. Reynier views as an obvious exaggeration Cervantes' often cited quote from Persiles y Sigismunda that in France neither sex failed to learn Spanish, but agrees that this period did perhaps contain the greatest number of bilingual scholars:

> Il y a bien de l'exagération sans doute dans la phrase, souvent citée, de Cervantès: "En France ni homme ni femme ne manquent d'apprendre l'espagnol": mais il est vrai que jamais peut-être il n'y eut à Paris autant de maîtres de cette langue, autant de grammaires, de dictionnaires, de recueils de proverbes et de locutions courantes, d'éditions bilingues présentant le texte en face de la traduction.[1]

Despite the obvious influence of Spanish literature during the first quarter of the seventeenth century, G. Lanson contends that it was more a question of politics than of literature:

> Sans prendre donc à la lettre la phrase de Cervantès, on ne peut nier que la curiosité et le goût de la langue espagnole s'éveillent justement dans le premier quart du XVII^{e} siècle: le rapprochement des cours de Madrid et de Paris, après la mort de Henri IV, et l'arrivée d'une jeune reine espagnole sont à cette date un stimulant plus efficace qu'aucune admiration littéraire.[2]

Lanson diminishes the role of Spanish literature while emphasizing that of Italian. He contends that a disproportionately greater number

of Italian works entered France between 1600 and 1660, and of the Spanish works which entered, only the theater was well represented. Original texts of the novel and the nouvelle were rare. Lanson attributes this imbalance to several factors: the greater esteem in which the French had always held Italian literature; the war; and the city of Lyon which acted as as intermediary between France and Italy.[3] Lanson does not deny a Spanish influence, but as earlier stated, views it as the result of political circumstances rather than literary merit:

> Mais la grande différence est que l'Italie a des classiques . . . au lieu que les ouvrages espagnols qui se publient chez nous sont surtout des ouvrages de professeurs de langues ou d'Espagnols réfugiés; en général les circonstances rendent raison de l'impression en France plutôt que la qualité reconnue de l'ouvrage.[4]

Gustave Reynier similarly cites the double marriages in 1615 of Louis XIII and Anne d'Autriche and of Elisabeth de Bourbon and Philippe IV as events which facilitated the Spanish penetration into France.[5] J. Mathorez analogously views these marriages as the determining cause for France's infatuation with all that was Spanish. Mathorez situates this influence from the death of Henri IV in 1610 to around the year 1640:

> L'influence espagnole que l'on constate en France depuis l'époque de la mort de Henri IV jusqu'aux environs de l'an 1640 est due à la constante infiltration de nombreux éléments de population hispanique entrés dans le royaume au XVI^e siècle et après le triomphe définitif du Béarnais; la cause déterminante de cet engouement pour les modes espagnoles fut le rapprochement des deux cours par un double mariage.[6]

The conjunction of the two countries attained by the political strategy of Marie de Médicis in which France gave an "Infante" to Spain and received a queen was not, however, without opposition. A campaign against the Spanish marriages erupted, but the weddings were celebrated in spite of this hostility. Louis XIII held only limited affection for Anne d'Autriche and detested her Spanish entourage. In 1618 he consequently ordered the departure of all the Spaniards from court.[7]

The tremendous influence Spain nonetheless exerted upon literary currents in seventeenth-century France is attributable to a variety of factors. During the regency of Marie de Médicis, France experienced a social and economic crisis comparable to that Spain had already undergone. This contributed to France's reception of the social satire found in the picaresque novel and authors such as Alemán. The influx of Spanish mannerisms and culture can also be ascribed to non-literary negative determinants. In the Roman Réaliste au XVII^{e} Siècle, Gustave Reynier states:

> Le succès général de tous ces romans ne s'explique pas seulement par des raisons littéraires. Jamais on n'a été si curieux des choses d'Espagne que dans la première moitié du XVII^{e} siècle. On considère encore l'Espagnol comme l'ennemi héréditaire, on a plaisir à le voir ridiculisé par le pamphlet et la caricature; on s'amuse des rodomontades qu'on lui prête; on applaudit à de plaisants discours traitant de la "contrariété d'humeur" qui sépare les deux nations.[8]

The passion for all things Spanish was clearly not a consensus of opinion. Among the genres which were, however, reprinted for their merit or their fashion, Lanson includes the novel and the nouvelle.[9]

Definition

In the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance the Italian novella was a story that could be true or fictional, written or recited.[10] Deloffre's succinct definition of the Italian novella is that of a brief, humorous, willfully obscene, ordinarily framed narrative: "un récit assez bref, plaisant et volontiers grivois, ordinairement encadré."[11] While stressing the fact that the seventeenth-century nouvelle acquired a different meaning from the tale, R. Baldner defines the Italian novella as follows:

> The word nouvelle as used by Renaissance writers was obviously derived from the Italian novella and referred to a short prose narrative modelled upon Boccaccio's Decameron Tales or any of the other Italian collections of tales.[12]

The novella was a predominately middle-class form of entertainment consisting of an extraordinary variety of literary types. Among the representative genres R. Clements and J. Gibaldi have discovered in the typical pre-Cervantesque novella are: the fabliau, chivalric romance, lai, beast epic, fable, folk tale, fairy tale, miracle of the Virgin, Saint's life, and an assortment of stories originating from Biblical, Greco-Roman, Oriental, and historical sources.[13]

Characteristics. The Italian novella offered a great variety of subjects which G. Hainsworth has categorized into four areas: (1) short anecdotes; (2) tales in the tradition of the fabliaux or exempla which demonstrate the astuteness of man or the opposite, his foolishness; (3) serious, often adulterous love generaly ending in a

tragic manner; and fatal events in general; (4) the different fortunes of two separated lovers who are providentially reunited at the end in the fashion of the Greek novel.[14] The form of the novella was on the contrary almost invariable: primary importance of the plot; strict adherence to chronological order; and emphasis on brevity. Because of this emphasis upon brevity, the genre is especially valuable in the information it provides on contemporary manners. Clements and Gibaldi contend that no other genre in literature has conveyed a truer portrait of society than did the Italian novella:

> Since the novellas (before Painter, Fenton, and the seventeenth-century Spaniards) usually illustrated realism unembellished with imagination, opinion, didacticism, or philosophical embroideries, this genre conveyed as true a portraiture of society as literature has offered.[15]

As the major interest of the novella was the narrative sequence, the storyline, or the plot, the primary objectives of language and style in the novella were decorum, variety, verisimilitude, unity, and harmony. Clements and Gibaldi maintain that: "Decorum, simplicity, and general accessibility remained the novellist's concerns throughout the three-hundred-year efflorescence of this tradition."[16] The characters are essentially types who exhibit no psychological development. As Clements and Gibaldi state, character transformations represented a revolution rather than an evolution:

> If a moral or spiritual or psychological transformation does occur within a personage, it is usually on the sudden, and the metamorphosis is completed almost instantaneously--more a revolution than an evolution in character.[17]

Origin. Godenne situates the origin of the nouvelle in France with the appearance in 1486 of Les Cent Nouvelles nouvelles.[18] These tales were licentious and obscene, and continued the Gallic tradition of the medieval fabliaux. They offered little variety or originality of subject, and most often presented themes from the French fabliaux or morality tales, or were simple adaptations from the country in which the nouvelle originated: Italy.[19]

The nouvelle had its origin in Boccaccio's Decameron which had been composed between 1350 and 1355, more than a century before Les Cent Nouvelles nouvelles. F. Deloffre states that in general the sixteenth-century writers of nouvelles remained faithful to the tradition of the Cent Nouvelles nouvelles.[20] Whether the subjects were drawn from Italian or French models, Deloffre indicates that at this time they were almost always humorous:

> Pour le moment, que les sujets proviennent de modèles italiens--parmi lesquels Boccace est l'un des moins scabreux--ou français, ils ont presque toujours un caractère plaisant. Il y est surtout question comme dans les Novelle Forretane italiennes, de maris trompés ou trompeurs, de femmes gaillardes, de moines et de chambrières.[21]

While citing Rabelais as a notable author of nouvelles in the tradition of the Cent Nouvelles nouvelles, he contends that the genre's momentum was gained only in the middle of the century.[22] In 1548, Noël du Fail published his Propos rustiques, a collection of peasant scenes containing anecdotes and comments on contemporary morals. In 1545, a second translation of the Decameron appeared, and 1558 marked the appearance of a rough draft of Marguerite de Navarre's Heptaméron.[23] Deloffre indicates that although the Heptaméron was not a totally novel

concept, the predominant influence of Boccaccio acted in a positive manner to prevent a servile imitation of her French predecessors. Marguerite insisted that her narratives were true histories and consistently uncovered moral teaching in these historical stories.[24] Godenne remarks that Marguerite de Navarre conferred a serious tone upon the traditional narration in the Heptaméron.[25] Systematically avoiding scabrous and obscene details, the author assigned a moral purpose to what was previously a licentious genre. This is not to reduce, however, Marguerite's debt to Boccaccio:

> Toutefois, Marguerite de Navarre ne peut revendiquer l'idée de tels sujets qui revient proprement à Boccace: à côté de récits plaisants, ceux-là qu'on traduit ou imite surtout à l'époque, Le Décaméron contient des narrations dramatiques et développées qui ont dû servir de modèles à l'auteur français.[26]

The historical setting of the Heptaméron, which was initially entitled the Décaméron is moreover identical to that of Boccaccio: a group of men and women gathered together in the countryside decide to pass the time by telling stories. Marguerite's framework consists of an aristocratic party of five men and five women who have been marooned by floods in an abbey in southern France. Boccaccio's natural disaster is that of the Black Death, and his framework consists of seven women and three men who flee from Florence to a suburban villa.

The Heptaméron brought the following innovations to the French nouvelle: (1) amorous passion of a serious nature as exemplified by Boccaccio's Fiametta; (2) subjects drawn from veritable events which pose problems of marriage and honor in often serious terms; (3) a counterbalance of tragic and comic; (4) a variety of tones.[27]

Marguerite de Navarre is also to be recognized for her continual staunch defense of women which was unique in this era of anti-feminist literature. Deloffre states that Marguerite's unprecedented moral intentions in the Heptaméron raised the nouvelle to a new height among dramatic genres:

> Grace à la présence de ces éléments tragiques, qui soulignent les intentions morales de l'auteur, le genre de la nouvelle s'enrichit, se diversifie, gagne enfin, avec l'Heptaméron, une dignité qui le met au premier rang des genres dramatiques.[28]

Cervantes and the Spanish novela

Cervantes' Novelas ejemplares were published in 1613. In the prologue, the author purports to be the first writer of novelas in the Spanish language. He further contends that all his subjects are original:

> Yo soy el primero que he novelado en lengua castellano; que las muchas novelas que en ella andan impresas todas son traducidas de lenguas extranjeras; y éstas son mías propias, no imitadas ni hurtadas.[29]

Caroline Bourland substantiates Cervantes' claim, stating that: "in the Novelas ejemplares he virtually created the genre for Spain."[30] Bourland traces the beginning of the "epoch of the short story in Spain"[31] to the 1613 appearance of the Novelas ejemplares. Bourland specifies that only two ingenuous attempts to compose stories in the Italian manner had previously been produced in the Spanish language: Timoneda's Patrañuelo (c. 1566) and Eslava's Noches de invierno (1609)[32] All the collections of novelas published in Spain before 1613 are

derived either from the Italian novella or from Medieval literature.[33]

Noteworthy among authors who have lauded the innovation of the Novelas ejemplares include Charles Sorel. In his Bibliothèque française, Sorel admits the chronological priority of Boccaccio, Marguerite de Navarre, Iver, and Bandello, but credits the Spanish, notably Cervantes, with having produced the more natural and localized nouvelles. Sorel distinguishes both Italian and Spanish nouvelle from the novel because of their verisimilitude. The nouvelles are "vraysemblables" and "veritables." Unlike the licentious novellas of Boccaccio, Sorel remarks that women could read those of Cervantes and his followers without apprehension:

> On commençoit aussi de connoistre ce que c'estoit des choses vraysemblables par de petites narrations dont la mode vint qui s'appelloient des nouvelles. On les pouvait comparer aux histoires veritables de quelques accidens particuliers des hommes. Nous avions desja veu Les Nouvelles de Boccace et celles de la Reyne de Navarre. . . . mais les Espagnols nous en donnerent de plus naturelles et de plus circonstantiées qui furent Les Nouvelles de Miguel de Cervantes remplies de naivetez et d'agremens. On a veu depuis celles de Montalvan et quelques autres qui ont toutes eu grand cours à cause que les dames les pouvoient lire sans appreheension au lieu que quelques unes d'auparavant estoient fort condamnées, comme celles de Boccace qui sont de tres mauvais exemple.[34]

In 1737, the abbé Prévost insisted on the originality of Cervantes' Novelas as opposed to those of Boccaccio and Marguerite de Navarre which he classified as contes. The following passage by Prévost is reproduced in Deloffre's Nouvelle en France à l'âge classique:

> les Italiens appellent nouvelle toute espèce de récit amusant, tout ce que nous renfermons sous les dénominations de Contes et de Nouvelles. Ce n'est donc pas d'eux précisément, c'est des Espagnols que nous tenons le genre d'ouvrages qui porte ce dernier nom; et Miguel Cervantès

> merite la gloire d'être l'inventeur d'une sorte de nouvelle plus estimable que tout ce que l'on avait eu en ce genre avant qu'il eût publié ses douze nouvelles. Elles ne ressemblent en rien à celles de Boccace et de la plupart des auteurs italiens, qui sont précisément ce que nous appelons des contes. C'est dans cette classe qu'il faut ranger l'Heptaméron, ou les nouvelles de la reine de Navarre, composées sur le modèle du Décaméron.[35]

Cervantes' Novelas are not servile imitations of Italian plots, but the Spanish author does nonetheless remain faithful to the tradition of the novella.[36] Bourland remarks on the prevalence of the Italian influence in seventeenth-century Spain, stating that:

> Even Cervantes, whose claim to originality of subject matter is so valid, could not escape his inheritance. He owes to the Italians the novela form, the idea of reflecting life within the compass of a brief narrative.[37]

She contends that Cervantes' followers repeatedly used Italian themes and had recourse to the novella for both form and plot:

> In general tenor as well as in the use of specific episodes of frequent occurrence in the Italian novelle, the romantic short Spanish story of the seventeenth century repeatedly makes plain its Italian ancestry; it moves among the same classes of society and rehearses the same types of incidents. Young love thwarted by parental tyranny, the hostilities of rival families, shipwrecks, capture by pirates, the reuniting of long separated parents and children, the recognition and restoration to power of hapless princes, these and other themes common in the old Italian short stories are repeated in the Spanish novela.[38]

Analogous to the distinctively French character of nouvelles adapted from the Spanish novela, the Spanish authors frequently adapted the Italian novella with little change or, localizing the place of action in Spain, transposed the novella in such a manner as to be specifically Spanish in characteristics.[39] Bourland points out that the Spanish

imitators had a marked preference for the Italian novella of a romantic or adventurous cast.[40] She lists the following characteristics of the romantic novelas: multiple incidents; frequent shifts of scene; loosely constructed plots; digressions or extraneous episodes; the recitation of letters, verses and poems. All of which served to lengthen the Spanish novela.[41] Even when no new episodes are added to the original, Bourland states that: "the greater discursiveness of the Spanish novelistas, their habit of developing or illustrating an idea stated simply in the Italian, generally adds not a little to the length of the story."[42] As concerns style, the Spanish romantic novela is usually deliberate and explicit, containing relatively little dialogue but much narrative in direct quotation. The emotions expressed are generally extreme and contain excessive classical allusions or rhetorical figures.[43] The genre is generally characterized by stylized situations and stock characters.

Cervantes' Novelas exemplares consist of twelve exemplary novelas, all of which have contemporary settings. Some are of realistic tendencies with detailed descriptions of ordinary life and characters who are often from the lower classes. Other novelas express abstract ideas related to Cervantes' personal philosophy. The greater portion of the novelas are of a romanesque demeanor with complicated and extraordinary plots and unrealistic upper class protagonists. In general Cervantes' primary objective was, however, the Aristotelian concept of verisimilitude. The originality of the plots and the greater length of the Spanish tales are two points in common shared by almost all the novelas.

G. Hainsworth has recourse to d'Audiguier's statement that:

"L'ordre de ces nouvelles . . . est imité de l'Histoire éthiopique ou des amours de Daphnie et Cloé"[44] in formulating his own hypothesis. The Aethiopica began in medias res, and the stylistic processes employed by Heliodorus consisted of digressions, long textual conversations, and the omniscience of the author. The Greek novel is generally characterized by the frequent recourse to fortune as the master of human destiny and the utilization of certain given facts: children abandoned with objects by which they are later recognized; the separation and subsequent adventures of two lovers who have pledged their eternal love and mutual fidelity. Hainsworth bases Cervantes' originality on his combined utilization of a short prose narration with the processes of the Greek novel:

> En employant, aux fins de la courte narration en prose, les procédés artistiques du roman grec, Cervantes brisait entièrement, et c'est là une de ses plus grandes originalités, avec la tradition de la novella, en même temps qu'il inaugurait la "nouvelle" moderne.[45]

Clements and Gibaldi compare Cervantes' genius as a master of variety to that of Boccaccio, and commend the "dazzling diversity of subject matter, characterization, stylistic approaches, and narrative techniques. . . ." presented in the Novelas ejemplares.[46] Cervantes abandoned the framing device utilized by Boccaccio and Marguerite de Navarre, and chose instead to present the novelas: "as discrete narratives with no connective frame-plot to bind them together."[47] In emphasizing the exemplary quality of Cervantes' novelas, De Armas states the following concerning the difference in subject matter of the novela with its Italian model:

> the many immoral and indecent incidents of the Italian novella where prelates and nuns are as guilty of sexual offenses as the marquis de Sade, are eliminated for problems of honor and courtship, where love is regarded as an ideal, and where the result is often marriage.[48]

The form of Cervantes' novelas also differs from that of the Italian. Boccaccio structured his novellas according to theme. He characteristically names the protagonists of his narration, the location of the action, and systematically develops the series of events in a chronological order. Cervantes often begins in medias res in the style of the medieval epics and romances. The reader is thus immediately drawn into the narrative. Hainsworth summarizes Cervantes' import as follows:

> D'une part, il enseignait à raconter, avec le maximum d'effet, une histoire déjà intéressante en elle-même. De l'autre, en revendiquant les droits de l'artiste, il libérait le genre de l'esclavage des intrigues extraordinaires, et rendait possible la nouvelle moderne, dont la base n'est souvent qu'une série d'incidents banals, une scène de moeurs, ou un caractère.[49]

The success of the Novelas ejemplares was immediate. Twelve editions were printed within ten years of their first appearance, and they were translated into French in 1615 and into Italian in 1626.[50] Bourland maintains that Cervantes' influence was more a general impetus given to a particular type of composition as opposed to a specific imitation by subsequent writers.[51] She situates the approximate apogee of the novela from 1620 until the middle of the century, and cites the romantic love story as the preponderant type.[52]

The Spanish adaptations in general excluded the more indecent novellas or omitted the more risqué details. This self imposed censor-

ship is explained by the fact that the Church controlled the license to print. Tales which portrayed the clergy in an unfavorable manner were necessarily excluded.[53] The marked anticlerical sentiments present in the early novella were not to be reproduced in seventeenth-century Spain. Marguerite de Navarre possessed an exceptional freedom of expression as the king's sister. The less fortunate Cervantes was of necessity cautious in view of the active Spanish Inquisition and the Spanish kings' role as protector of the Church. This caution was similarly shared by Tirso de Molina and María de Zayas whose novelas exemplified the reward of virtue and punishment of vice.

The post-Cervantine Spanish novelas were purportedly exemplary in purpose, but the realization of this claim was primarily titular. In reality, the seventeenth-century novela and comedia shared the same absence of moral purpose or didacticism. The active Inquisition which forced a self imposed censorship on adaptations of Italian novellas inspired a similar need to defend the novelas' exemplary character.

Affinity of the comedia and novela

The Spanish comedia and novela were closely related in the seventeenth century. Deloffre refers to this affinity as one of close symbiosis: "Il en allait ainsi en Espagne, où comedia et novela vivaient en étroite symbiose."[55] The number of dramatic productions inspired by Cervantes' Quixote and the Novelas exemplares attest to the symbiotic relationship of the two genres. Florence Yudin lists eleven contemporary plays inspired by these two works as corroboration of "the facility with

which Cervantes' novels entered the seventeenth-century dramatic repertory. . . ."[56] Yudin examines the affinity of the two genres in a dissertation entitled "Genre Identity in the Golden Age: The Post-Cervantine Novella Corta and the Comedia." Yudin's examination of formal critical theory, prefatory and various commentary supports the existence of this interdependence.

In "La desdicha por la honra," Lope de Vega categorically states that the two genres have identical precepts and affirms that their function is to entertain: "yo he pensado que tienen las nouelas los mismos preceptos que las comedias, cuyo fin es auer dado su autor contento y gusto al pueblo. . . ."[58] Lope, as had certain sixteenth-century playwrights, characteristically incorporated material from the chivalric novels and Italian novella in his dramatic elaborations.[59] Suárez de Fugueroa, Avellaneda, and Tirso are other seventeenth-century writers who commented on the affinity of the comedia and novela, and it is of particular import that Castillo, Montalbán, Salas, Tirso, Lope, and Zayas were novelists as well as dramatists.[60]

The Lopesque comedia was the established national genre in Spain; the novela, the nascent one. Yudin contends that a systematic reproduction of dramatic conventions existed in the post-Cervantine novela corta. "The restriction of plot to a single theme; frequent recourse to the devices of intrigue, disguise, and direct discourse; flatness of character and pairing of fictional roles," comprise the typical dramatic conventions Yudin lists as being uniformly duplicated.[61] Novelists consciously strived to emulate and reproduce the techniques and innovations which characterized the Lopesque comedia.[62] Yudin's assertion that there existed a comedia novelesca and a novela comediesca

establishes the complexity of this rapport:

> First, there is the question of the comedia which depends for its effectiveness upon peculiarly novelistic techniques; second, the novela corta which utilizes particularly those recourses and presuppositions common to Lopesque comedia.[63]

An analogous pattern is observed in the influence that the two genres exercised in France. Theatrical plays were adapted from the Spanish novela and French nouvelles were inversely based on Spanish comedias. Cervantes' novela, "Las dos doncellas," inspired no fewer than seven comedies in France;[64] Tirso's comedia, Palabras y Plumas, is the source of both Scarron's and Boisrobert's nouvelle identically entitled "Plus d'effets que de paroles." Deloffre accurately cites Boisrobert's Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses as an illustration of this phenomenon, but incorrectly dates it 1656 and assigns seven nouvelles to this volume:

> C'est ainsi que, des sept Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses (1656) deux au moins transposent des comédies espagnoles, puisque Plus d'effets que de paroles est tiré de Palabras y plumas de Tirso de Molina et la Vie n'est qu'un songe de la célèbre comédie de Calderón.[65]

As indicated in the following section, the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses (1657) consist of four nouvelles, only one of which is based on a novela.

Boisrobert's Sources

Boisrobert's nouvelles, as do those of his sources, represent a distinct preference for the romanesque. An analysis of each of

these nouvelles and the originals will be presented in Chapters 4 through 7. Boisrobert's direct sources included Rotrou, María de Zayas, Tirso de Molina, and Calderón de la Barca.

Rotrou. Rotrou (1609-1650) was one of the principal authors of the tragi-comedy in France in the early seventeenth century, and was instrumental in initiating the comedy which was practically inexistent before 1620. He was especially influenced by the Spanish comedia, and in particular Lope, and was the first French author inspired by the Spanish theater. La Bague de l'Oubli (1628), Occasions perdues (1633), L'Heureuse Constance (1635), and Saint Genest (1647) are among plays he based in whole or in part on comedias by Lope. Although it is d'Ouville's Esprit folet which launched the epoch of Spanish theatrical imitations, Rotrou's first adaptation of a Spanish comedia, La Bague de l'Oubli was published in 1628, almost ten years prior to d'Ouville's comedy. Martinenche credits Rotrou with being the first author before Corneille to have seen more than a clever plot and romanesque imbroglio in the Spanish comedia: "Mais il est le seul avant Corneille qui semble entrevoir dans la comedia plus et mieux qu'une intrigue vive et ingénieuse. Les autres imitateurs du théâtre espagnol continuent à n'y chercher que des complications romanesques."[66]

Rotrou's tragi-comedy L'Heureuse Constance is based on two comedias by Lope: El Poder vencido and Mirad a quien alabáis. L'Heureuse Constance is the source of Boisrobert's first nouvelle, L'Heureux Desespoir.

María de Zayas y Sotomayor. María de Zayas (1590-1661) is best known for her Novelas ejemplares y amorosas, a two part collection which consists of twenty novelas. The framework of the novelas is in the tradition of Boccaccio's Decameron: a social reunion. The pretext utilized by Zayas is that of the illness of one of the members of this social group. The first part, entitled the Novelas ejemplares y amorosas appeared in 1637. The second volume, the Desengaños amorosos was published in 1647 and is distinctly negative in tone. The latter novelas are more militantly feminist and of a more tragic or macabre nature. G. Hainsworth states the following concerning the Desengaños:

> Celles-ci, qui seraient à en croire l'auteur, strictement vraies, sont toutes destinées à montrer la méchanceté du sexe masculin, et leurs données, assassinats, viols, vices contre nature, envoûtements, ont en général un caractère tragique ou macabre.[67]

The author is characterized by an advanced feminism which she espouses in the prefatory "Al que leyere" of the Novelas:

> ¿qué razón hay para que ellos sean sabios y presuman que nosotras no podemos serlo? Esto no tiene a mi parecer más respuesta que su impiedad o tiranía en encerrarnos, y no darnos maestros.[68]

Zayas advocates equal educational opportunities and rights for women, and blames men for women's ignorance and oppression.

Although María de Zayas was profoundly religious, Irma Vasileski astutely remarks that none of her heroines professed a genuine religious vocation or chose divine love without having first experienced the deceptions of human passion:

> En ninguna de las veinte novelas de nuestra autora encontramos una heroína con vocación religiosa genuina, o sea, una mujer que escoja "el amor divino" sin haber tenido que sucumbir primero al "loco amor" y sufrido fuertes desengaños de él.[69]

Zayas' militant feminism and defensive religiosity are clearly exhibited in "La perseguida triunfante," the novela Boisrobert chose to imitate. Entitled "L'Inceste supposé," this is the second tale in the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses.

Tirso de Molina. Fray Gabriel Téllez (1583-1648), who wrote under the pseudonym of Tirso de Molina, is known universally as the creator of Don Juan, a dramatic type which has become symbolic with unsatiable carnal desire. A disciple of Lope de Vega, Tirso's theatrical talent was formulated in an atmosphere of religious and university intellectualism. He is second to Lope as the most prolific dramatist of the Golden Age, and is alleged to have composed over four hundred plays, only eighty-six of which have survived. His literary production was diverse in both form and linguistic elements: comedias de enredo, historical and palatial comedias and dramas; autos sacramentales; biblical, theological, hagiographical comedias; idioms of peasantry and nobility, Castilian, Portuguese, Galician, Asturian. María del Pilar Palomo remarks that sentimentality and lyricism dominated the theological and the abstract in his theater.[70]

Tirso's literary production is characterized by its satirical and comical force, its realism and regionality, its metaphorical symbolism, and its dominating protagonists. He is especially renowned for his daring and spirited feminine characters. As a friar of the

Mercenarian order, Tirso was often criticized for the vices, obscenities, and sensualism portrayed in his comedias, and in 1625 he was ordered by the Council of Castile to cease his theatrical writing for a period of ten years. His adherence to the Council's mandate is questionable.

Palabras y Plumas (c. 1614-1615) is a palatial comedia from Tirso's secular theater. The comedia's thesis is based on a novella from Boccaccio's Decameron: a young man spends all his money on jousts, tourneys, and feasts in order to win the love of a beautiful but indifferent lady. Boisrobert's third nouvelle, "Plus d'effets que de paroles," is adapted from Tirso's Palabras y Plumas.

Calderón de la Barca. Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681) is the last great author of Golden Age drama and signifies its maturity. He was a disciple of Lope de Vega. Calderón wrote both secular and religious and philosophical dramas, and his literary production consists of comedias, autos sacramentales, and various other shorter forms. Calderón was a court poet, and his comedias are essentially aristocratic and nationalistic. His theater is characterized by its philosophical import and profundity. As a baroque writer, his characterizations are susceptible to exaggerations and distortions. His protagonists are often more symbolic than human, and clearly dominate the secondary characters. Valbuena y Prat states that: "Una gran parte de figuras calderonianas, se mueve en el orden de los 'tipos' sociales, o encarnación de cualidades."[71]

His style is sonorous, and as Valbuena y Prat has observed, Calderón succeeded in integrating poetry and action: "Calderón her-

manará de tal manera la poesía decorativa con la acción, que aun lo más lírico es inseparable del fin teatral para que ha sido preparado."[72]

La Vida es sueño is Calderón's masterpiece and ranks among the most universally acclaimed of all Spanish dramas. It is based in part on the concept of the dream as symbol of the vanity of worldly possessions. "La Vie n'est qu'un songe" is the final nouvelle of Boisrobert's Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses and is an adaptation of the Spanish comedia.

Notes

[1] Gustave Reynier, Le Roman Réaliste au XVII[e] Siècle (Paris: Hachette, 1914), p. 74.

[2] Gustave Lanson, "Etudes sur les rapports de la littérature française et de la littérature espagnole au XVII[e] siècle (1600-1660), Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, 1896, pp. 57-58.

[3] Lanson, pp. 65-66.

[4] Lanson, pp. 62-63.

[5] Reynier, p. 74.

[6] J. Mathorez, "Notes sur l'infiltration des espagnols en France aux XVII[e] et XVIII[e] siècles," Bulletin Hispanique, 1932, vol. 34, p. 35.

[7] Mathorez, pp. 31-32.

[8] Reynier, p. 73.

[9] Lanson, p. 63.

[10] Robert J. Clements and Joseph Gibaldi, Anatomy of the Novella (New York: New York University Press, 1977), p. 5.

[11] Frédérick Deloffre, La Nouvelle en France à l'âge classique (Paris: Didier, 1967), p. 19.

[12] Ralph Baldner, "The Theory and Practice of the Nouvelle in France from 1600 to 1660," Diss. University of California 1957, pp. 7-8.

[13] Clements and Gibaldi, p. 14.

[14] George Hainsworth, Les "Novelas exemplares" de Cervantes en France au XVII[e] siècle (1933; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971), pp. 23-24.

[15] Clements and Gibaldi, p. 93.

[16] Clements and Gibaldi, p. 24.

[17] Clements and Gibaldi, p. 65.

[18] René Godenne, Histoire de la nouvelle française aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1970), p. 19.

[19] Godenne, p. 21.

[20] Deloffre, p. 10.

[21] Deloffre, pp. 9-10.

[22] Deloffre, p. 10.

[23] Deloffre, p. 11.

[24] Clements and Gibaldi, pp. 87-88.

[25] Godenne, p. 21.

[26] Godenne, p. 22.

[27] Deloffre, p. 11.

[28] Deloffre, p. 13.

[29] Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, "Prólogo al lector," Novelas ejemplares (Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1938), p. 15.

[30] Caroline Bourland, The Short Story in Spain in the Seventeenth Century (Northampton: Smith College, 1927), p. 3.

[31] Bourland, p. 3.

[32] Bourland, p. 3.

[33] Hainsworth, p. 22.

[34] Charles Sorel, La Bibliothèque françoise, in "A Critical Edition of La Bibliothèque françoise," by Myron Low Kocher, Diss. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1965, p. 324.

[35] Deloffre, p. 18.

[36] Hainsworth, p. 23.

[37] Bourland, p. 11.

[38] Bourland, pp. 12-13.

[39] Bourland, p. 13.

[40] Bourland, p. 17.

[41] Bourland, p. 19.

[42] Bourland, p. 13.

[43] Bourland, p. 21.

[44] Hainsworth, p. 26.

[45] Hainsworth, p. 26.

[46] Clements and Gibaldi, p. 16.

[47] Clements and Gibaldi, p. 49.

[48] Frederick A. de Armas, Paul Scarron (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972), p. 103.

[49] Hainsworth, p. 29.

[50] Bourland, p. 9.

[51] Bourland, p. 9.

[52] Bourland, p. 10.

[53] Bourland, p. 17.

[54] Clements and Gibaldi, pp. 185-186.

[55] Deloffre, p. 31.

[56] Florence L. Yudin, "Genre Identity in the Golden Age: The Post-Cervantine novela corta and the comedia," Diss. University of Illinois 1964, p. 49.

[57] Yudin, p. 7.

[58] Lope de Vega, "La Desdicha por la honra," in Novelas a la Señora Marcia Leonarda, ed. John D. and Leora A. Fitz-Gerald (Erlangen:

K.B. Hof- und Universitäts-Buchdruckerei von Junge & Sohn, 1913), p. 38. This passage is indicated on p. 7 of Yudin's dissertation.

[59] Yudin, p. 44.

[60] Yudin, p. 51.

[61] Yudin, p. 109.

[62] Yudin, p. 111.

[63] Yudin, p. 55.

[64] Deloffre, p. 31.

[65] Deloffre, p. 31.

[66] Ernest Martinenche, La Comedia espagnole en France de Hardy à Racine (1900; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), p. 173.

[67] Hainsworth, p. 175.

[68] María de Zayas y Sotomayor, Novelas amorosas y ejemplares, ed. Agustín G. de Amezua (Madrid: Aldus, S. A., 1948), pp. 21-22.

[69] Irma V. Vasileski, María de Zayas y Sotomayor: su época y su obra (Madrid: Playor, S. A., 1972), p. 41.

[70] María del Pilar Palomo, ed. Obras: Tirso de Molina (Barcelona: Vergara, S. A., 1968), p. 43.

[71] Angel Valbuena y Prat, Calderón: su personalidad, su arte dramático, su estilo y sus obras (Barcelona: Juventud, S. A., 1941), p. 29.

[72] Valbuena y Prat, p. 18.

Chapter 3

QUARREL

In 1639, d'Ouville launched a new era in French literature with the appearance of his Esprit folet, a comedy adapted from La dama duende of Calderón. Within the next five years, he produced five more plays based on Spanish models, and other French authors followed suit. If d'Ouville was responsible for initiating this fashion in the theater, Hainsworth contends that Scarron was the initiator of a new age in the translation of the Spanish novela, and also the author who played the most important role:

> L'histoire de toutes ces traductions est assez embrouillée, mais il n'est pas douteux que Scarron n'y joue le principal rôle. Le premier en date, il est aussi le plus considérable par la simple quantité de ses nouvelles et, comme nous le verrons, il est seul à envisager d'une façon originale sa besogne de traducteur.[1]

Hainsworth lauds Scarron's wisdom in choosing the least extravagant of the Spanish novelas, and in particular his selection of two novelas, La Hija de Celestina and El Castigo de la miseria of a realistic vein. By their contribution to the cause of realism Hainsworth contends that Scarron's nouvelles announce the modern nouvelle.

> les nouvelles de Scarron ont une importance indéniable et, tout en contribuant puissamment à la cause du réalisme, elles annoncent certainement, par leur principe au moins, la nouvelle.[2]

The nouvelles of Boisrobert and of d'Ouville are posterior to those of Scarron, and according to Hainsworth, probably inspired by Scarron's example.[3] Hainsworth sees no logic in the quarrel between Scarron and d'Ouville, and places blame solely on d'Ouville. As proof of Scarron's superiority, Hainsworth points out that his nouvelles were reprinted without interruption until the eighteenth century. He does, however, give credit to d'Ouville and Boisrobert for having contributed to the popularization of the Spanish genre and having inspired original productions in the field of the nouvelle:

> Ceux-ci ont cependant le mérite d'avoir contribué, après Scarron, à mettre à la mode le genre espagnol, et à inspirer du même coup, de la part des auteurs français, des productions originales dans le domaine de la nouvelle.[4]

The quarrel between the three authors was the almost inevitable result of their common knowledge and exploitation of Spanish literature. The first part of Scarron's Roman comique, which contained two Spanish novelas, was published in 1651, and in 1656, he published the Nouvelles tragi-comiques tournées de l'espagnol en français. Both works precede the 1657 publication of d'Ouville's Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires and Boisrobert's 1657 publication of the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses. The following scheme indicates the titles, dates, contents, and sources of the respective volumes of nouvelles by Scarron, d'Ouville, and Boisrobert:

Scarron: Les Nouvelles tragi-comiques. The first four nouvelles appeared as a collection in 1656. The license from the king for the first four is dated April 23, 1655, and they were printed individually

during a two year span which precedes and follows the appearance of the collection. The final nouvelle, "Le Châtiment de l'avarice," did not appear until 1662. The following list indicates the chronological series of the nouvelles and their sources. Emile Magne's Bibliographie Générale des oeuvres de Scarron was consulted in determining the dates of the individual nouvelles.[5]

1. "La Précaution inutile," 1655 (María de Zayas, Novelas amorosas y exemplares, "El Prevenido engañado")

2. "Les Hypocrites," 1655 (Salas Barbadillo, La Hija de Celestina)

3. "L'Adultère Innocent," 1656 (María de Zayas, Novelas amorosas y exemplares, "La Burlada Aminta y venganza del honor")

4. "Plus d'effets que de parolles," 1657 (Tirso de Molina, Palabras y Plumas)

5. "Le Châtiment de l'avarice," 1662 (María de Zayas, Novelas amorosas y exemplares, "El Castigo de la miseria")

D'Ouville: Les Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires. The Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires were published as a collection on February 1, 1657. Each of the six nouvelles contains a separate title page and "Extraict du Privilege du Roi" which consists of the date the king's license was granted and the printing date. As Hainsworth has indicated, the separate title and pagination signify individual publications.[6] The license for all six nouvelles is October 26, 1655. The printing dates for each of the nouvelles and their respective sources are listed below.

1. "La Précaution inutile," 1655 (María de Zayas, Novelas amorosas y exemplares, "El Prevenido engañado")

2. "S'Aventurer en perdant," 1656 (María de Zayas, Novelas amorosas y exemplares, "Aventurarse perdiendo")

3. "La Belle Invisible ou la constance esprouvee," 1656 (Castillo Solórzano, Alivios de Cassandra, "Los Efectos que hace amor")

4. "L'Amour se paye avec l'amour," 1655 (Castillo Solórzano, Alivios de Cassandra, "Amor con amor se paga")

5. "La Vengeance d'Aminte affrontée," 1655 (María de Zayas, Novelas amorosas y exemplares, "La Burlada Aminta y venganza del honor")

6. "A la fin, tout se paye," 1655 (María de Zayas, Novelas amorosas y exemplares, "Al fin se paga todo")

Boisrobert: Les Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses. Boisrobert's Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses were printed as a collection on May 12, 1657, and did not appear individually before this date as had the nouvelles of Scarron and d'Ouville.

1. L'Heureux Desespoir" (Rotrou, L'Heureuse Constance which is based on Lope de Vega's El Poder vencido y amor premiado and his Mirad a quién alabáis)

2. "L'Inceste supposé" (María de Zayas, Desengaños amorosos, "La Perseguida triunfante")

3. "Plus d'effets que de paroles" (Tirso de Molina, Palabras y Plumas)

4. "La Vie n'est qu'un songe" (Calderón de la Barca, La Vida es sueño)

The immediate source of the quarrel was a play by Francisco de Rojas, Obligados e offendidos, y Gorron de Salamanca, adapted by both Scarron, Boisrobert, and later by Thomas Corneille. Scarron's play was entitled L'Ecolier de Salamanque ou les Ennemis généreux, and was staged at the Marais theater in 1654. Boisrobert's play, entitled Les généreux ennemis was staged by the Bourgogne Hotel before that of

Scarron, although the "privilège" dated December 29, 1654, was slightly posterior to the December 4 "privilège" of Scarron's play. Tallemant writes of the ensuing quarrel between the two authors in the Historiettes:

> Scarron, le frere de Corneille et luy, avoient imité tous trois de l'espagnol un [sic] pièce qu'on appelle l'Escolier de Salamanque. Celle de Corneille n'estoit pas si avancée; mais les deux autres estoient achevées. Les Comediens vouloient jouer celle de Scarron la premiere: Mme de Brancas, à qui Boisrobert le dit, pria le prince d'Harcourt, luy à qui les Comediens ont bien de l'obligation, car il les fait jouer souvent en ville, de leur en parler. Le Prince menaça les Comediens de coups de baston, s'ils faisoient cet affront à l'Abbé, qui contant cette aventure, disoit: "Ma foy, le prince d'Harcourt a pris cela héroïcomiquement."[7]

The two authors who had previously been on amicable terms were now to become engaged in a bitter and endless quarrel. In a letter to Monsieur de Marigny, Scarron attacks Boisrobert's merit:

> Quand je songe que j'étois né assez bien fait pour avoir mérité les respects des Bois-Roberts de mon tems,
> Vous savez bien que ce prêlat bouffon;
> De beaucoup d'impudence, et de peu de mérite;
> Un très grand sorboniste.[8]

In the same letter, Scarron indirectly criticizes Boisrobert in an allusion to the recent corruption in Paris of the Spanish language.[9] In a letter to Monsieur l'Abbé Despagny, Scarron alludes to Boisrobert's morals in a reference to the homosexuality of certain abbots:

> Et j'en connois d'assez peu sages
> Pour enganimêder leurs pages.
> Dieu me garde de telles gens,
> Baisans les gens malgré leurs dents.[10]

D'Ouville becomes embroiled in this quarrel with his publication of a translation of María de Zayas' Novelas amorosas y exemplares shortly

after the appearance of Scarron's adaptation of this same work. An already tense situation is further aggravated by a direct criticism of Scarron contained in d'Ouville's prefatory "Advis au lecteur." As this "Advis"--the primary subject of this chapter--has not been republished since the seventeenth century, the following reproduction in its entirety has been considered necessary:

> Entre plusieurs Nouuelles composées en Espagnol, par vne Dame qui se peut égaler, non seulement pour l'inuention, mais pour l'élocution encore aux plus celebres Escriuains du siecle; ie vous en ay choisy six qui m'ont parû les plus agreables, & les plus dignes d'estre traduittes en nostre langue. Ne vous estonnez pas Lecteur, si ie debutte par vne que vous aurez desia veuë, de la traduction de Monsieur Scaron, & que ie vous donne encore le mesme titre qu'il luy a donné de la Precaution inutile, qui m'a parû plus naturel que si ie l'eusse nommée apres l'Espagnol Precautionado engagnado, Le Precautioné attrappé. Outre que Monsieur Scaron, qui certainement merite la reputation qu'il s'est acquise, affecte vn stile comicque qui luy est tout particulier & auquel il a tousiours reüssi, & que de mon costé, i'ay affecté de m'attacher au sens tout pur, comme au stile tout serieux de la Dame que i'imite; ce qui par consequent rend la chose assez differente. Ie vous ay encore fait connoistre cette Dame par son nom, ce que Monsieur Scaron n'a pas voulu faire: Ie ne sçay si c'est qu'il l'ait ignoré, ayant comme il l'a confefsé [sic] luy mesme, receu ce present d'vn amy, qui peut-estre l'ignoroit encore. Ou si ce qui me paroist plus vray semblable ne vous ayant donné qu'vne seule Nouuelle de cette excellente Femme, il vous ait voulu cacher son sexe, de crainte que vous ne iugeassiez moins fauorablement de son trauail. Pour moy qui connoist son merite & sa suffisance, qui sçay que son stile ne doit rien a celuy des Autheurs les plus acheuez de sa Nation, & qui sçay d'ailleurs que le Ciel n'a pas esté plus auare de ses faueurs & de ses lumieres à ce beau sexe qu'au nostre; Ie dy hardiment que c'est vne Femme que ie prends icy plaisir & de suiure, & d'imiter, & i'ose dire encore auec plus de hardiesse, que si ie la sçauois bien imiter, vous iugeriez par ce seul ouurage qu'il n'y a gueres d'hommes qui la surpassent. Vous vous estonnerez sans doute, Lecteur, de ce que ie luy donne si liberalement vne de ces six nouuelles, que quelques-autres attribuent à ce fameux Autheur Espagnol qui entre plusieurs autres beaux ouurages a composé la Foüine de Seuille, laquelle i'espere vous donner traduitte dans peu de iours: Mais outre que la

> chose est incertaine, comme luy & nostre Maria de Gayas[sic] ont parû de merite êgal, amis, & contemporains, Ie suis bien asseuré que ie n'en sçaurois receuoir aucun reproche du costé d'Espagne. Si ce petit trauail vous plaist, ie pourray dans quelque temps vous donner vn second volume des Nouuelles de la mesme Dame, & vn autre en suitte de ce fameux Autheur de la Foüine, duquel ie vous ay déja parlé.[11]

The publication in 1657 of the Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires is the last work by d'Ouville published during the author's lifetime. D'Ouville had spent seven years in Spain, and had for seventeen years been translating works from Spanish into French. Notwithstanding Scarron's excellent linguistic abilities in Spanish, d'Ouville's knowledge of the Spenish language was unquestionably superior to that of his rival. Yet the "Advis au lecteur" contains several inexplicably blatant textual and grammatical errors. The author states that the six nouvelles he has translated are by María de Zayas. He acknowledges that some attribute one of these nouvelles to the famous Spanish author (Castillo Solórzano) who composed the Foüine de Seuille, (La Garduña de Sevilla), but as the case is not certain and both authors are friends and contemporaries and appear of equal merit, he feels assured that he will not be reproached by the Spanish. The nouvelle in question is one of two that were unquestionably written by Solórzano. D'Ouville's third nouvelle, "La Belle Invisible ou la Constance éprouvée," is a translation of "Los Efectos que hace amor" contained in Solórzano's Alivios de Cassandra. His fourth nouvelle, "L'Amour se paye avec l'amour" is also from a novela comprising Solórzano's Alivios entitled "Amor con amor se paga."

The Novelas amorosas y exemplares by María de Zayas had appeared in 1634, and Castillo Solórzano's Los Alivios de Cassandra in 1640. It is

incomprehensible that d'Ouville could have been unaware of the identity of the very authors he so flawlessly translated. Nor is it conceivable that as experienced a translator as d'Ouville could have made the blatant grammatical errors found in this "Advis." In a retaliatory preface to a later collection of the Nouvelles tragi-comiques, "A qui lira," Scarron reveals two mistakes which occur in what the author of this "Advis" claims to be the Spanish title of Scarron's "La Précaution inutile." According to the author of the "Advis," the Spanish title would be "Precautionado engagnado." Scarron points out that the author has committed two errors in this title. He has omitted the necessary article, and he has written "engañado" with a "g" instead of the correct tilde. Moreover, as Scarron aptly observes, the actual title of María de Zayas' novela is "El Prevenido engañado." This preface, "A qui lira," is not included in the 1948 edition of the Nouvelles tragi-comiques referred to by the present study, but is reproduced in Chardon's Scarron inconnu:

> Il faut que j'adjoute icy ce que je crois estre obligé de répondre à l'avant-propos, qu'un libraire imprimeur ou quelque autre homme de cette force-là s'est advisé de mettre au-devant de la Nouvelle, pareille à ma "Précaution inutile," que l'on a depuis peu imprimée sous le nom de Douville. Cet Avant-Propos est un grand menteur en beaucoup d'endroits en ce qui me touche, est peu sincère en François et fort ignorant en Espagnol, puisqu'en ces deux mots "Precautionado Engagnado" il a fait deux fautes, l'une d'avoir oublié l'article, l'autre d'avoir écrit Engañado avec un G, ce qui ne se fait jamais en Espagnol, mais toujours avec un N "con tilde."[12]

It appears highly improbable if not ludicrous that the translator of this novela would have been incapable of either textual or grammatical reproduction of its title. The obvious conclusion is that the "Advis"

was not written by d'Ouville, and it is surprising that previous scholars have failed to perceive the incongruity of this "Advis" with d'Ouville's literary production. Even more surprising is the fact that Scarron apparently had no difficulty in accepting that d'Ouville was the author of the "Advis." Scarron's preface, "A qui lira," was written in response to the "Advis" which preceded d'Ouville's text. In this preface Scarron mentions that at the time he was having the "Précaution inutile" printed, he was visited by Boisrobert. Boisrobert told him that he was going to have his brother's translation of María de Zayas' novelas published. Scarron told him that one of his friends had already adapted the "Prevenido engañado" into French, and that as the work was deplorably written in Spanish, it would not be advantageous for d'Ouville to publish a translation. The following is a partial reproduction of Scarron's preface:

> Dans le temps que je faisois imprimer la Précaution inutile, M. de Boisrobert me fist l'honneur de me venir voir et, dans la conversation que nous eusmes ensemble, il me dit qu'il alloit faire imprimer les Nouvelles de Marie de Zayas, mises en françois par son frère. Je l'advertis qu'un de mes amis (c'estoit de moy que je parlois) avait fait une version du Prevenido Engañado, qui est le vray titre Espagnol, et non pas Precautionado, comme l'a mis témérairement et faussement le gaillard Avant-Propos de qui je parle; je l'advertis que cette Nouvelle s'imprimoit sous le titre de la Précaution inutile et qu'elle feroit tort à celle de son frère, parce qu'elle auroit l'advantage de la nouveauté et que l'on l'avoit comme refaite, parce qu'elle est déplorablement escripte en Espagnol, n'en déplaise à l'Avant-Propos qui dit le contraire.[13]

In 1654 Boisrobert and Scarron had quarreled over the Ecolier de Salamanque which both authors had translated into French. Scarron's Nouvelles tragi-comiques which includes the "Précaution inutile" was published as a collection in 1656. The license from the king for all

but the last nouvelle was granted on April 23, 1655 and "La Précaution inutile" appeared later in this year. The exact printing date is unknown as this volume has not been preserved.[14] D'Ouville's Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires containing the same translation was published as a collection in 1657, but "La Précaution inutile" had appeared separately in 1655. The license from the king is October 26, 1655, and the printing date is November 20, 1655. D'Ouville's nouvelle must of necessity be posterior to that of Scarron, "since the former's publication created a quarrel between both authors,"[15] as indicated by the preface cited above.

In the Historiettes, Tallemant writes that Boisrobert took d'Ouville to Le Mans to live with one of his brothers who was a canon:

> Il y a trois ans qu'il mena Douville au Mans pour y vivre avec un de ses freres qui est chanoine. . . . Ce pauvre Douville est mort depuis deux ans.[16]

In 1654, d'Ouville had in fact been brought by Boisrobert to Le Mans to live as a pensioner not with his brother, but with his nephew Pierre Leprince, who received two hundred livres "en consideration des soins qu'il prendra près la personne du sr d'Ouville, son oncle, frere dudict sr de Bois-Robert, pendant le temps qu'Iceluy sr d'Ouville sera demeurant avec ledict sr Leprince comme pensionnaire."[17] Tallemant would thus be writing in 1657, and if his dates are accurate, d'Ouville would have died in 1655. As the license from the king was granted on October 26, 1655, Coke concludes that d'Ouville was still alive in October of this year to write his famous "Advis."[18] As this assumption is based on d'Ouville's composition of the "Advis," and as Coke states, there are no documents attesting the exact date of d'Ouville's death

or burial,[19] the validity of Coke's hypothesis depends on that of the "Advis."

In light of the blatant textual and grammatical errors found in the "Advis," the validity of its authorship is by no means unquestionable. Until and unless further documentation is discovered, no definitive answer can be given, and one can only theorize from existing evidence. Speculation based on the evidence now available tends to deny d'Ouville's authorship of the "Advis." Coke based his assumption that d'Ouville died after October 1655 on the fact that the "Advis" was written during this month. One can easily utilize this same event to prove that d'Ouville died prior to the appearance of the "Advis." D'Ouville had been living at Le Mans on a pension provided by Boisrobert since 1654, and Boisrobert thus had complete access to d'Ouville's papers after his death. If his contemporaries were not suspicious that Boisrobert had written the "Advis" to d'Ouville's Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires, they were not equally naive when in 1657 he published the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses comprising four tales adapted from Spanish. If this adaptation by Boisrobert is indeed an unjust exploitation of his brother's works, he was wise enough to recognize the limitations of his credibility and to acknowledge d'Ouville's authorship of La Fouïne de Seville which he had published in 1661. He could hardly have done otherwise, however, since the "Advis" had already promised a soon-to-appear translation of this work.

The most logical conclusion is that Boisrobert composed the "Advis" immediately after the death of his brother, or perhaps without d'Ouville's knowledge during the days immediately preceding his death.

Boisrobert had previously quarreled with Scarron, and the thematic and grammatical content of the "Advis" is more easily comprehended if Boisrobert is the author. As previously mentioned, Boisrobert had been embroiled in a quarrel with Scarron since their mutual translation of Rojas' Gorron de Salamanca in 1654. D'Ouville had had no prior dispute with Scarron, and had become involved in the quarrel only as the direct result of the "Advis." Boisrobert's knowledge of Spanish was good, but did not approach the caliber of that of either d'Ouville or Scarron. He had not translated the tales contained in the Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires, and could easily have ignored the original authors and titles. Boisrobert could easily have made the grammatical errors contained in the "Advis." D'Ouville could not have made these mistakes, nor did he have any strong personal reasons or political motivation to attack Scarron. Boisrobert had a sufficient knowledge of Spanish and of d'Ouville's translations to compose the "Advis," but not enough to produce a flawless text. He had personal and political motivation for attacking Scarron. And he had the opportunity to scavenge his brother's documents. The most plausible conclusion to be derived from the existing evidence is that Boisrobert composed the "Advis" to d'Ouville's Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires.

Notes

[1] G. Hainsworth, Les "Novelas exemplares" de Cervantes en France au XVII[e] siècle (1933; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971), pp. 170-171.

[2] Hainsworth, pp. 192-193.

[3] Hainsworth, p. 194.

[4] Hainsworth, p. 200.

[5] Emile Magne, Bibliographie Générale des oeuvres de Scarron (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Leclerc L. Giraud-Badin, 1924), pp. 198-203.

[6] Hainsworth, p. 194.

[7] Tallemant des Réaux, Historiettes, ed. Antoine Adam (Dijon: Gallimard, 1960), I, 410.

[8] Scarron, Oeuvres (1786; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970), I, 201-202.

[9] Scarron, Oeuvres, I, 203.

[10] Scarron, Oeuvres, VI, 144.

[11] Antoine le Métel, sieur d'Ouville, "Advis au lecteur," Les Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires (Paris: Luynes, 1656).

[12] Henri Chardon, Scarron Inconnu (Paris: Champion, 1903), p. 332.

[13] Chardon, pp. 332-333.

[14] Magne, Bibliographie, p. 198.

[15] Frederick A. de Armas, Paul Scarron (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972), p. 107.

[16] Tallemant, Historiettes, I, 410.

[17] Boisrobert, Epistres en Vers, ed. Maurice Cauchie (Paris: Hachette, 1921), II, 169. Cauchie does not indicate the document he is quoting.

[18] James Wilson Coke, "Antoine Le Métel, Sieur d'Ouville: his Life and his Theatre," Diss. Indiana University 1958, p. 40.

[19] Coke, p. 40.

Chapter 4

THE FIRST NOUVELLE: "L'HEUREUX DESESPOIR"

The Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses were published in 1657 and consist of four nouvelles all of which were adaptations of other works. In the prefatory epistle to Fouquet, Boisrobert purports to have utilized Spanish sources which he adapted to French taste:

> Si les plus beaux Esprits du siecle à qui i'ay communiqué ces Nouuelles, auant que d'oser les publier sous l'authorité de vostre nom, ne m'ont point flatté, les sujets que i'ay tirez tous nuds & tous simples de l'Espagnol, & que i'ay rectifiez selon nos manieres, en sont tout particuliers & tout beaux, les incidens en sont tout merveilleux & tout surprenans, le stile en est pur & net, & enfin ce petit ouurage peut passer parmy les plus delicats de la Cour pour galand & pour agreable.[1]

One contention of this epistle to be dealt with is that of his sources. Three of the four nouvelles are, as Boisrobert claims, adaptations of Spanish works. The first tale, "L'Heureux Desespoir" is based on Rotrou's L'Heureuse Constance, which in turn was based on two comedias by Lope de Vega, El Poder vencido y amor premiado and Mirad a quién alabáis. Boisrobert's tale exhibits no evidence that the author had read the Spanish originals. The second tale, "L'Inceste supposé" is adapted from María de Zayas' "La Perseguida triunfante." "Plus d'effets que de paroles," the third tale, is based on Tirso's Palabras y Plumas. Boisrobert's last nouvelle, "La Vie n'est qu'un songe," is drawn from Calderón's well-known comedia entitled La Vida

es sueño.

As concerns Boisrobert's contention that his style is pure and clear, one remark must be made. The above paragraph serves as an excellent illustration. This passage, which consists of one sentence containing eight commas and seven &'s, is representative of the author's style throughout the Nouvelles. He often has sentences that are continued for two or more pages and habitually uses commas in place of periods.

On the other hand, his claim to have adapted the Spanish subjects according to French taste is unquestionably true. The greatest value of the Nouvelles is perhaps the manner in which Boisrobert adapts them into French. He retains very little that is typically Spanish, and the end result is a remarkable illustration of the tremendous cultural distance between the two countries in the seventeenth century. The fact that the Nouvelles are adaptations as opposed to translations provides a wealth of historical and literary information about the two countries that transcends the value of the individual nouvelle. The aim of this chapter is to study each nouvelle and its Spanish counterpart in order to define more clearly their differences and to ascertain characteristics that are specific to the respective cultures.

"L'Heureux Desespoir" is the first tale of Boisrobert's Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses, and, as indicated by G. Hainsworth in an article published in 1947, "may be looked upon as a camouflaged version of a play by Rotrou, L'Heureuse Constance, itself derived from the Spanish."[2]

This chapter will examine in chronological order the following:

the two comedias by Lope which served as Rotrou's sources, El Poder vencido (1614) and Mirad a quién alabáis (1621); Rotrou's L'Heureuse Constance (1631); and Boisrobert's "L'Heureux Desespoir" (1657).

Rotrou's play will be analyzed in view of its similarities and dissimilarities with the two Spanish comedias. Boisrobert's tale will be studied analagously to determine the degree of his debt to his direct source and to ascertain if any evidence exists to support the abbot's claim that all the subjects of the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses were drawn from Spanish.

Lope's El Poder vencido y amor premiado

Lope's El Poder vencido y amor premiado is a three act comedia in verse that was published around 1614. The basic elements used by Rotrou can be summarized as follows: The prince meets a beautiful woman of lesser nobility and falls in love. His brother is, as he later discovers, also in love with this woman and she with him. In order to gain her love, the prince resorts to several ruses, the first of which is to order his brother to marry the duchess to whom the prince is affianced but whom he has never seen. Once his brother has departed, the prince fabricates letters to convince his brother that his lover is married and vice versa. The two discover the ruse and are secretly married, at which time the prince acquiesces and offers his hand to the duchess.

The major characters are: Fabricio, Celia's father; Roberto, the prince; the count, Fabio, the prince's brother reared by Fabricio; Celia, with whom Fabio is in love; and Colín, Fabio's servant and gra-

cioso.

The first act commences with a visit by the prince and count to a small Italian village in which the count had been reared, and the subsequent first meeting of the prince and Celia, with whom Fabio shared a mutual love. The prince, unaware of their love, was immediately stricken by Celia's beauty, and the attention he paid her resulted in a dialogue on jealousy between the two lovers. Celia maintained that Fabio's jealousy was no more than the projection of his own feelings mirrored upon the prince in whom he saw only his own reflection. Fabio, correct in his perception of the prince's attraction to Celia soon learned from the prince himself the depth of his feeling. His brother revealed that until the moment he saw Celia, he had been untouched by love. The count attempted to convince the prince that Celia did not appear so beautiful that he would love her at first sight. Were this true, he argued, having known her for years, he himself would have already surrendered to her beauty. Upon the approach of Celia, the prince departed, revealing his suspicion of his brother's love. Unknown to Celia and Fabio, the prince listened in secret to the quarrel between the two lovers. Fabio informed Celia that the prince had seen a woman who had taken his life and liberty from him. His brother had subsequently contracted his services in order to discuss the remedy of this love with this woman. After much hesitation, Fabio revealed that she was this woman. Celia was furious that the man whom she had loved for so many years could so candidly declare that another loved her, and angrily informed the count that he would never see her again. Fabio attempted to explain that he had only wanted to test her love, but Celia refused to accept

his recantation.

Upon her departure, the prince reappeared, and Fabio reported that Celia valued the prince's love. The prince responded that he wished to repay his debt to the count. He announced that Fabricio and he had confirmed his marriage to Celia. He therefore bequeathed to Fabio the beautiful Estela to whom he himself was betrothed. The deceitful prince assured the count that Celia had willfully accepted his hand in marriage:

> Finalmente, ¿es cosa cierta
> que Celia es ya tu mujer?
> Conde, mi mujer es Celia.
> ¿Y ella quiere?
> Ella quiere. (El Poder vencido, p. 538)

Fabio departed, and as the prince boasted that the count would not possess Celia, she approached, overhearing his words. The prince's explanation was that Fabio was to marry Estela: "porque el más tierno Leandro / ama con esta cautela," (El Poder vencido, p. 539) and that her beauty being worthy of a king, she was therefore his. Afterwards, he asked the reluctant Fabricio for Celia's hand in marriage.

Act I ends with a conversation between Celia, the count, and his servant Colín. Celia explained that her marriage was in response to his own: "Pues, Conde, si tú te vas hoy a casar con Estela, / qué he de hacer, sino vengarme?" (El Poder vencido, p. 540) After hearing further accusations as to the count's cruelty, his servant pronounced a long tirade condemning Celia's cruelty, and justifying the marriage his master had been forced to accept. Fabio confirmed his servant's words, and Celia recognized that the prince had deceived them both, for she had agreed to marry him only after having been told of the

count's marriage. Colín proposed the following plan: As no one in Belflor had ever seen the count, Colín would go there to meet Estela, pretending to be his master. He would appear such a blundering fool that she would despise him, and the count would therefore be freed of his obligation. The three of them would then flee the country to escape the prince's wrath:

> Yo os daré remedio tal,
> que a esa desdicha entretenga;
> En Belflor no han visto al Conde,
> y con su traje y sus señas,
> fingiré que el Conde soy,
> que a casarme voy con ella.
> Allí, tonto y mentecato,
> tanto haré, que me aborrezca
> lo que fuere menester,
> hasta que el Príncipe vuelva
> a Nápoles, y nosotros
> por ti, generosa Celia,
> donde pasándote a España,
> a Flandes o Inglaterra,
> nos libremos de su furia. (El Poder vencido, p. 542)

The two lovers accepted Colín's proposition, and vowed that the earth would bury them alive were they to marry another during their separation. Act I terminates with the gracioso's humorous echo addressed to Flora that if he married during this absence, a tavern would bury him alive.

Act II opens with the first appearance of the Duke Alejandro and his sister Estela. Alejandro is in the process of reading the letter he had just received from Prince Roberto notifying him of the proposed substitution of his brother as Estela's husband:

> Habiendo sido forzoso casarme con Celia, mi prima, me parece que no falto de nuestras enviando en mi lugar a mi hermano, persona, que si en sangre me iguala, en las demás partes me excede, como lo dirán su entendimiento, gracia y talle. El mayor testigo desta verdad, será el mismo, que llegará despues deste avisto, puesto que a la ligera, para que en

mayor brevedad se case con Estela. (El Poder vencido, p. 543)

Shortly afterwards, the count disguised as a servant and Colín disguised as the count, appeared. Estela was totally disgusted with Colín who masterfully played his role of a boorish imbecile, speaking of nothing but ears, mules, and food. She was, to Fabio's misfortune, impressed with his appearance and intelligence, and asked him to visit her secretly that night. The count was disillusioned with this turn of events, and lamented his separation from Celia, fearing that his absence would destroy her fidelity.

The prince had in the meantime employed a servant to pretend that he had just returned from Belflor where he had witnessed the wedding ceremony of the count and Estela. Forced to accept a situation without hope, Estela confessed her love for Fabio to the prince, and asked only that he allow her time to overcome her grief. He continued in his role as deceiver by sending his servant back to Belflor to advise the count that Celia was now married. The count, accompanied by Colín, had meanwhile gone to his designated rendez-vous with Estela. They were discovered by Alejandro, and a fight erupted in which Alejandro was wounded and Colín, believed to be the count, was taken prisoner. Fabio escaped and soon after was spotted by the prince's messenger, who relayed the false tale of Celia's marriage. The distraught lover bemoaned his fate, repeatedly voicing the phrase: "Fiad de mujer y ausencia!" (El Poder vencido, p. 555) He condemned Celia's cruelty repeating the words she had spoken upon their separation:

"Tú verás, Fabio querido,
el poder vencido.

Tú verás, Fabio amado,
el amor premiado." (El Poder vencido, p. 555)

Act II ends with the repetition of the above verses and the count's assertion that there was no certain faith were there was absence.

In Act III, the prince continued his efforts to deceive Celia by presenting a forged letter as evidence that the count had married. Resigned to Fabio's marriage, Celia accepted the prince's hand, and the wedding plans were begun. In Belflor, Alejandro was outraged that the prince had had the audacity to send his sister a boorish imbecile to marry and plotted revenge. The count had meanwhile returned disguised to the village where shepherds informed him of the approaching marriage of the prince and Celia. He was able to approach Celia while the prince was with Fabricio. Accompanied by the shepherds, he offered her a song, the words of which he said had been told by a lady to her lover upon his departure:

Una canción les compuse,
no sé cómo no la dicen
de palabras que una dama
dijo a un galán al partirse.
Pues partiendo temeroso
del poder de un hombre insigne,
ella le daba a entender
que era su amor invencible.
(Cantan)
"Tú verás, Silvio querido,
el poder vencido;
tú verás, mi Silvio amado,
el amor premiado." (El Poder vencido, p. 563)

Celia immediately recognized him, and in the conversation which followed, the two quickly discovered that the prince had deceived them. As Alejandro's army approached, Celia and Fabio hurried away to get married. The prince could not at first understand Alejandro's violent

opposition to the substitution of his brother as Estela's husband. The situation was clarified with Colín's arrival and subsequent explanation. Celia and Fabio returned to announce their marriage. Although momentarily outraged, the prince quickly acquiesced and offered to marry Estela, to whom he apologized for having scorned. Colín in turn gave his hand to Flora, and the comedia terminates with his recapitulation of the theme:

> Sí, pido;
> porque en sucesos tan varios,
> da fin el poder vencido
> y nunca el amor premiado. (El Poder vencido, p. 568)

The comedia is rich in verbal imagery and themes specific to Lope and Golden Age Drama such as that of the justo versus the gusto; the image of the estrella as the foremost and guiding light; the comic relief of the gracioso who humorously echoes his master's words. As, however, Boisrobert did not have direct recourse to the Spanish comedia, but utilized only Rotrou's adaptation, only those events which ultimately filtered into the nouvelle have been emphasized. The quotations were chosen with a view to illustrating the tremendous separation which exists between the Spanish comedia and the French adaptations.

Lope's Mirad a quién alabáis

The second source of Rotrou's "L'Heureuse Constance" is a comedia in three acts by Lope entitled Mirad a quién alabáis, published in 1621.[4] The primary theme of the Spanish play is that of the king's

advisor who is sent to bring back the king's betrothed and himself falls in love with her and she with him. The major characters are the king, who is in love with Celia but is affianced to the duchess of Milan; Don César de Avalos, the king's advisor and Celia's brother; Celia; and Fabio, César's servant and the gracioso.

In the first act it is learned that the king had sent the admiral Don César de Avalos to Milan to bring back the duchess of Milan to whom he was affianced. The king, however, confessed to Roberto that he loved Celia, César's sister with whom Roberto was also in love. César returned to announce that he had accomplished his mission and had left the duchess a short distance from the city. The king was untouched by César's praise of her beauty, which in effect resulted in his suspicion that his ambassador loved the duchess. He thus sent the admiral a letter in which he announced he did not wish to marry her. César was consequently faced with the task of relaying the king's message to the duchess, who quickly decided that the admiral had greater merit than the king, and would thus be her husband.

Act II opens with a dialogue between the duchess and Cesar, whose honor demanded that he marry only after having received the king's permission. The duchess questioned this decision stating that she believed César valued the king's love more than her own. She vowed to lead her army against the king, warning that time and fortune could result in change and the subsequent loss of the present opportunity. The king in turn appointed César to conduct his army against the duchess. Upon learning this news, the duchess declared that, deceived by the admiral's loyalty to his king and cowardice towards her, she was retiring to Milan. César vowed he loved her and would tell the king of his love.

The king, however, refused to consider César's request for the duchess's hand in marriage, and accusing him of betrayal, ordered that he be imprisoned. Act II closes on the admiral's lamentation that his present misfortune was the consequence of having praised an angel to which his servant wittily retorted that his master's misfortune was in not having taken possession of this angel with a body:

> Cesar: En mi ejemplo, caballeros,
> mirad a quién alabáis;
> que todo el daño que tengo
> nació de alabar un ángel.
> Fabio: No nació; llevalde preso;
> sino de no haber tomado
> posesión de ángel con cuerpo. (Mirad, p. 49)

Act III opens with the king's justification of his actions and his repeated assertion that he hated the barbarous duchess. Roberto arrived praising a beautiful pilgrim from Rome whom he had just seen. The king decided that he would go to see and praise her in order to make Celia jealous. The lady in question was none other than the duchess in disguise. Upon seeing her, the king too was stricken by her beauty. He announced his intention to marry this beautiful pilgrim, but stubbornly refused to allow the admiral to marry the duchess. Unknown to César, the duchess was not only this beautiful pilgrim whom the king professed to love, but was also a guest of his sister in his own home. Upon seeing each other, she, however, pretended not to know him, claiming to be the queen of Hungary. The king had meanwhile decided to give his sister Blanca to César in marriage. Upon hearing this news, the duchess accused César of cowardice and baseness and declared herself his enemy. Alone with Fabio, she later confessed her love for César. César refused to lead the king's army

against the duchess, and instructed the king to appoint Roberto as general of his army and his sister's husband. To punish César for this action, the king gave him none other than the duchess in marriage. The alleged queen of Hungary quickly replied that she was the duchess, and that the king must heed his words. The king ceded, and asked for Celia's hand in marriage.

The play terminates with the king and César's acknowledgment that the comedia, Mirad a quién alabáis has ended:

> César: Mi dicha alabo.
> Rey: Alabalda;
> y acabando la comedia,
> Mirad a quién alabáis.
> César: Con licencia del poeta,
> alabando tal senado
> será la alabanza cierta. (Mirad, p. 59)

Rotrou's L'Heureuse Constance

Rotrou' five act tragi-comedy, L'Heureuse Constance, was published in 1631.[5] The play, which is set in Hungary, adapts elements found in Lope's El Poder vencido y amor premiado and his Mirad a quién alabáis. In both Spanish plays, the king (or prince) is betrothed to a foreign duchess whom he has not yet seen, and whose hand he scorns for another just before she is to arrive. The scheme of the three plays on the following page will serve to clarify the characters and action. As can be seen from this scheme, Rotrou utilizes both Spanish plays in composing his own unique version. He follows Mirad a quién alabáis in having an ambassador sent to bring back the king's bride. As in this Spanish play, the king in the meantime changes his mind.

Mirad a quién alabáis	El Poder vencido	L'Heureuse Constance
King	Prince	King
Duchess of Milan	Estela (Duchess)	Queen of Dalmatia
Celia	Celia	Rosélie
Don César (ambassador and Celia's brother)	---	Pâris (ambassador)
	---	Timandre (Rosélie's brother)
Roberto	---	---
Dona Blanca (King's sister)	---	---
Fabio (gracioso)	Camilo (gracioso)	Ogier and Argant (graciosos)
---	Count Fabio (Prince's brother)	Alcandre (King's brother)
---	---	Florinée (Queen's relative)
Conclusion:	Conclusion:	Conclusion:
King marries Celia;	Prince marries Estela;	King marries Queen;
César marries Duchess	Fabio marries Celia;	Alcandre marries Rosélie;
	Camilo marries Flora	Pâris marries Florinée

In Mirad a quién alabáis the king has for some time been in love with Celia, who continues to scorn his affections, whereas in El Poder vencido, as in Rotrou's play, the king's love is born at first sight. Rosélie, dressed as a peasant, was seen by the king who, also in disguise, was immediately stricken by her beauty and ordered Timandre to run after her: "Timandre, cours après, sois propice à ma flamme, / Et ramène à mes yeux cet objet de mon âme." (Rotrou, p. 438) Timandre attempted to thwart the king's design, reminding him that his engagement to another was already too far advanced to suffer such base thoughts. The king was not, however, to be discouraged, and again instructed Timandre to find and bring her back. Rosélie, as is revealed in the following scene, had been prohibited from appearing at court by her brother, who is none other than Timandre. The cause of this defense was the affection the king's brother, Alcandre, had shown her:

> Mon frère me défend de paroître à la cour;
> Il accuse mes yeux de donner trop d'amour;
> Ayant appris qu'Alcandre estimoit mon visage,
> Il me retient captive en ce pays sauvage. (Rotrou, p. 441)

This scene is without precedent in the two Spanish plays. As to the character of Rosélie's brother, this role is nonexistent in El Poder vencido, and is combined with that of the ambassador in Mirad a quién alabáis. Rosélie also has a third suitor in Rotrou's play in the form of the ambassador, Pâris, not present in either of the comedias. Timandre suggested his sister's marriage to this ambassador as the only means to stop the king's passion:

> Pâris depuis long-temps idolâtre vos charmes.
> Vous savez ses désirs, vous avez vu ses larmes,
> Nous joindrons votre sort à sa condition
> Si vous êtes sensible à son affection.
> Aujourd'hui ce seigneur arrive avec la reine;
> Etes-vous disposée à soulager sa peine?
> Ce remède, ma soeur, est le seul que je voi
> Dont on puisse arrêter les passions du roi. (Rotrou, p. 445)

Rosélie professed her blind and silent obedience to her brother's wishes, but at the end of the first act, confessed her love for Alcandre to her attendant, Floris.

> Triomphe, mon amour, de cette humeur craintive;
> Confessons, publions qu'Alcandre nous captive:
> Quelque effort qu'on oppose au bonheur que je veux,
> Jamais un autre objet n'obtiendra de mes voeux. (Rotrou, p. 446)

Floris counseled Rosélie that the decision was hers to make and not her brother's:

> Vous êtes amoureuse, et non pas votre frère;
> Ce qui se passera, c'est à vous à le faire;
> S'il désire à son gré vous choisir un époux,
> Faisant pour vous l'amour, qu'il l'épouse pour vous.
> (Rotrou, p. 447)

Act II opens with a discussion between Timandre and Pâris, who had just returned with the king's fiancée. Timandre proposed they discuss his marriage to Rosélie, and they agreed to continue this conversation after their meeting with the king. The king disdainfully listened to Pâris's praise of the queen's beauty, while openly posing questions as to the success of Timandre's mission. Shortly afterwards, Pâris received a letter from the king instructing him to return the queen to her country: "Pâris, reconduisez la reine en ses pays: / Les rois sans s'expliquer doivent être obéis." (Rotrou,

p. 452) The above scene and letter is a shortened version of that found in Lope's Mirad a quién alabáis. Rotrou reduces the elaborate praise found in the comedia, and condenses the original letter:

> "Don César de Aualos: Sin saber la causa porque no gusto casarme, volved donde habéis dejado a la duquesa, y ella con vos a Milán. Cuando los reyes no piden consejo, no tienen más respuesta que la obediencia. --El Rey." (Mirad, p. 31)

The French version merely alludes to the admiral's excessive praise of the queen's beauty as a possible source of the king's refusal. Rotrou nonetheless captures the essence of his source's action if not its poetry. Indeed the elaboration of the theme of praise in the original served little purpose other than poetic. The king had already confessed his passion for Celia before the ambassador's arrival with the duchess, but had hoped to satisfy this desire outside the bonds of matrimony. Equating his refusal with the admiral's excessive praise presents the king with a convenient excuse to demonstrate his indecisiveness. Both ambassadors are faced with the task of relaying the king's refusal to his fiancée, both repeat the tale of the king's suspicion of their intemperate exaltation of her virtues, and both obtain similar reactions: The fiancée decides that the ambassador possesses greater merit than the king and offers him her hand in marriage:

> Mieux vaut connoître tôt ces esprits inconstans,
> Que quand l'hymen nous joint, et qu'il n'en est plus temps;
> Au reste, si de vous cette humeur procède,
> Il faut que son mérite à vos mérites cède;
> Et vos perfections sont plus dignes de moi,
> Car on n'est point jaloux d'un moins parfait que soi:
> Rendre les soupçons vrais, c'est le propre des femmes.

> Pâris, il faut qu'hymen conjoigne nos deux âmes.
> (Rotrou, p. 457)

Whereas the French adaptation emphasizes jealousy and the actualization of suspicions, the Spanish source speaks solely of merit and esteem:

> Alza del suelo y no creas
> que yo sea tan cruel
> como él fué necio, y que sepa
> conocer lo que tú vales
> mejor que él, y por que veas
> que pues él te tuvo en más,
> es bien que tu me merezcas.
> De Milán has de ser Duque,
> . . . . . .
> Hoy has de ser mi marido. (Mirad, p. 37)

Rotrou aptly foresees his conclusion by creating in Pâris an ambassador already in love, thus far less susceptible to the queen's proposal. Don César was unencumbered and untouched by love upon meeting the duchess of Milan, thus more receptive to her advances. Astonished by his unexpected fortune, Pâris, with recourse to mythological examples, rationally analyzes his two choices:

> Ici deux déitésse présentent à toi,
> L'une te rend heureux, et l'autre te fait roi:
> Rosélie et la reine ont des appas extrêmes,
> L'une offre des plaisirs, l'autre des diadèmes;
> C'est à toi de nommer ou Vénus, ou Junon;
> Mais imite celui dont tu portes le nom.
> Agréable Cypris, divine Rosélie,
> J'incline en ta faveur, ton mérite me lie;
> L'espoir de t'acquérir me fait tout dédaigner,
> Je préfère tes fers à l'honneur de régner. (Rotrou, pp. 457-458)

Act II ends on Pâris's above meditation capitulated by his servant's comparison of his master with Don Quixote and of himself with the unfortunate Sancho, an adept foresight of the fugacity of fantasy:

Dieux! qu'un astre insensé régit sa destine!
Le plaisant Don Quichotte avec sa Dulcinée!
Je crois qu'on le gaussoit, lui parlant d'être roi:
Fut-il jamais Sancho plus malheureux que moi?

The first scene of Act III opens with the king's attempt to persuade Rosélie to accept his love. Alcandre secretly listened, commenting in asides on Rosélie's persistant refusal of the king's affections. Upon the king's departure, the two lovers vowed their eternal constancy to each other, but not before Alcandre had first questioned Rosélie's fidelity.

The rejected queen had meanwhile vowed to avenge the king's scorn. She proposed the immediate elevation of Pâris to the rank of king and husband. Pâris, however, pleaded for time, stating that he must first speak to the king: "Mais il faut différer ce bonheur pour un temps; / Je dois revoir mon prince avant ce mariage." (Rotrou, p. 466) The queen was irate at the ambassador's hesitation, and angrily left, warning that time, women, and fortune were inconstant objects which if not taken at the opportune moment, could be forever lost:

Connois-tu bien le temps, la femme et la fortune?
Sais-tu la qualité qui leur est si commune?
Ne prenant aux cheveux ces objets inconstans,
Possible perdras-tu fortune, femme et temps. (Rotrou, p. 466)

The precedent for the above scene is again Mirad a quién alabáis, but Rotrou omits the greater portion of Lope's dialogue. The condensed adaptation is much more direct, and lacks the sentimentality of the original. Rotrou's characters act out of vengeance and personal motivation, whereas Lope's characters are torn between love and honor.

Lope's duchess had also vowed to lead her army against the king, but her motivation was to follow César, not revenge:

> Obediciendo tu ley,
> saldré mañana de aquí
> mas por acercarme a ti
> que por hacer guerra al Rey.
> No voy con ánimo alguno
> de vengarme, ya lo estoy;
> siguiéndo te, César, voy. (Mirad, p. 39)

Her warning of the inconstancy of time, fortune, and women was an expression of her hurt rather than of her vengeance, and its purpose persuasive rather than vengeful:

> Pero si los accidentes
> del tiempo y de la fortuna
> pudieron dar vez alguna
> los sucesos diferentes,
> mira que suelen hacer,
> ya que pierdes la ocasión,
> mudanzas con poco; son
> tiempo, fortuna y mujer. (Mirad, p. 39)

Further proof of the contrasting sentiments expressed in the two works is the conversation between master and servant upon the respective departures of the duchess and queen. César's concern is with loyalty, and he states that truth will conquer jealousy and difficulties: "Yo sí; que trato lealtad, / porque venza mi verdad / celos y dificultades." (Mirad, p. 40) Following a later conversation with the duchess, César tells his servant that he values honor more than life: "sino que el honor que tengo / estimo más que la vida." (Mirad, p. 46) He confidently confirms his conviction that the duchess will not forget him so soon, for women of her state do not change so quickly:

Ahora bien, Fabio: yo vuelvo
a pedir licencia al Rey
para hacer mi casamiento;
que yo sé que la Duquesa
no me olvidará tan presto.
. . . . . .
Las mujeres principales
no son mudables tan presto. (Mirad, pp. 46-47)

Pâris, on the other hand, aspires only to again see Rosélie, and renounces the opportunity to rule an empire: "Partons sans différer: je me sens tout de flamme, / Je meurs que je ne voi cet objet de mon âme." (Rotrou, p. 467)

In the scene which follows, the king has just been informed by a confidant of the reciprocal love between his brother and Rosélie. As the text of Mirad a quién alabáis lacks the character of the king's brother, Rotrou has recourse to that of El Poder vencido in this portion of his adaptation. In the Spanish text, the prince suspected his brother's love for Celia and consequently spied upon the two lovers. As in the Spanish comedia, Rotrou's king resorts to a ruse in his attempt to marry Rosélie. As does his Spanish counterpart the king resolves to separate the two lovers by sending his brother to marry the woman to whom he is himself affianced:

La reine veut venger l'affront qu'elle a reçu,
Mais j'ai contre ce mal un remède conçu;
Vous pouvez de ses mains faire tomber les armes,
Assurer mon repos, et jouir de ses charmes;
Il faut vous disposer à voir sa majesté,
Pour réparer l'hymen que j'avois projeté. (Rotrou, pp. 470-471)

For Rotrou's queen, the king's brother is the second substitution presented, both of whom are ironically in love with Rosélie. In El Poder vencido, which lacks the character of the ambassador, the prince

informed his brother that Celia's father had agreed to the marriage of his daughter with the prince. The count was subsequently ordered to relieve the prince of his obligation to Estela:

> Fabricio y yo concertamos
> hoy que me case con Celia,
> desigual solo en ser pobre,
> igual en sangre y nobleza.
> Tú, Conde, me has de sacar
> de la obligación de Estela. (El Poder vencido, p. 538)

The count is deceived by his brother into believing that Celia had given her consent to this marriage. She in turn was led to believe that the count was marrying Estela voluntarily. The two lovers eventually discovered the prince's deception, and vowed their mutual fidelity. In a similar fashion, Rotrou's two lovers also pledged their constancy. They were, however, initially more lucid in recognizing the king's motives, as illustrated by the following conversation:

> Alcandre: Las! sans vous affliger, vous puis-je ôter
> de peine?
> Le roi me sacrifie au courroux d'une reine;
> Il veut, pour apaiser son animosité,
> Que j'aille posséder ce qu'il a rebuté:
> Il faut sans différer me rendre en Dalmatie;
> Etes-vous là-dessus maintenant éclaircie?
>
> Rosélie: Les effets sont enfin conformes à ma peur;
> Je n'attendois pas mieux de sa jalouse humeur.
> (Rotrou, p. 473)

Rotrou's Alcandre employed the same device utilized by Fabio to escape this marriage. He switched identities with his valet, Ogier. Alcandre instructed him to hide his admirable qualities and appear melancholy and crazy. He was nonetheless much more intelligible than was his Spanish counterpart, who demanded Estela's foot upon being introduced

and incomprehensively spoke of mules, ears, and food. Ogier spoke in hyperboles, exaggerating the queen's charms as well as his own. She experienced the same repulsion toward the disguised valet and attraction toward the master as did Lope's Estela. Rotrou reproduces only a fragment of the original dialogue between Estela and Fabio which occupies two pages of the comedia. He omits Estela's invitation to Fabio to visit her by night and the resulting imbroglio, and adapts only the initial lines in which the count attempted to blame his servant's ineptness on Estela's beauty.

The king had in the meantime failed to win Rosélie's love, and resorted to yet another ruse adapted by Rotrou from El Poder vencido, but with a simplified plot. The king had a letter delivered to Rosélie which was supposedly from Alcandre and which informed her of his marriage to the queen. Alcandre was simultaneously presented a letter from the king advising him of his marriage to Rosélie. Rotrou omits the extremely long and elaborate monologues describing the respective weddings. Whereas Celia was on the verge of marrying the prince when Fabio appeared to confirm his constancy, Rosélie persists in her refusal of the king's hand, and both of Rotrou's lovers adhere to their pledges of fidelity:

> Je l'adorois constante, et je l'aime légère;
> Je l'aimois la voyant, je l'aime sans la voir;
> Je l'aimois espérant, je l'aime sans espoir. (Rotrou, p. 488)

Rosélie similarly vowed her unwavering constancy: "Souffre qu'il soit volage, et que je sois constante." (Rotrou, p. 490) As she contemplated the crown the king had left her, resolving to persevere in her constancy, a letter was delivered to Rosélie accusing her of the

opposite. Its author was Alcandre who was disguised as a merchant. After having accused one another of infidelity, they discovered that neither had been unfaithful. This scene too is largely adapted from El Poder vencido minus ornamentation and poetry. The two lovers declared their love to the king, who preceded to have his brother imprisoned. The precedent for this event is found in Mirad a quién alabáis where the irrational king who had scorned the duchess's hand, had César imprisoned for asking to marry her:

> ¿Tú casar con la Duquesa?
> ¡Vive Dios, que ha sido enredo
> de los dos desde el principio
> que fuiste a nuestro concierto! (Mirad, p. 48)

The appearance in Hungary of the queen of Dalmatia disguised as a pilgrim is based on a similar episode in Mirad a quién alabáis. Rotrou's queen is intent on vengeance, but her avowed reason for unexpectedly appearing in Hungary was to see the person who had caused her scorn:

> J'ai voulu voir l'objet qui me fait mépriser:
> Jusque dedans ma cour tout le monde publie
> La charmante beauté de cette Rosélie. (Rotrou, p. 501)

Lope's duchess had a very different motivation, namely that of pursuing Don César. Disguised as a pilgrim, she encountered César's sister, who invited her home. She pretended never to have seen César, claiming to be the queen of Hungary (the country in which Rotrou sets his action). She contended that she had come to Rome because of her brother who was a prisoner of the Turks, and in order to see César's sister, whose beauty was renowned. Only upon learning

that the king had offered his sister to César in marriage did the angry duchess reveal her identity, accusing the admiral of cowardice and vowing to marry the king in revenge. She nonetheless revealed to Fabio her true intention to marry César:

> Fabio: ¿Luego ya del Rey serás?
> Duchess: No lo creas.
> Fabio: Pues ¿de quién?
> Duchess: Del Duque.
> Fabio: No entiendo bien.
> Duchess: Sordo del ingenio estás.
> ¿Cuándo has visto tu mujer
> sin amor buscar un hombre
> con peligro de su nombre
> y aun del vivir puede ser? (Mirad, p. 58)

The duchess succeeds in her designs, and the comedia ends with the double marriages of the duchess and César, and the king and Celia.

Basing his version on the above events, Rotrou modifies the details. Disguised as a pilgrim, the queen met Rosélie, and the two women proceeded to compete in praising the other's beauty. Pâris entered and was in the process of extoling Rosélie's beauty when he recognized the queen. The queen pretended never to have seen the ambassador, and his insistence to the contrary resulted in a dispute between Pâris and Rosélie's brother. As Pâris angrily left, he encountered the king who questioned his behavior. Upon seeing the queen, he was stunned by her beauty:

> Ah ciel! en tous les lieux qu'éclaire le soleil,
> Peut-on voir un objet à celui-ci pareil?
> La céleste beauté! les adorables charmes! (Rotrou, p. 507)

When he learned that this was the queen whose hand he had scorned, he repented his error and asked her to marry him. She questioned his

judgment in having sent his brother as his replacement in marriage. The king justified the merits of his brother, ordering that he be brought forward and offering him the object of his desires. Alcandre asked the queen's pardon for having deceived her, explaining that his faith had been pledged elsewhere. The king gave Rosélie to his brother, and again asked the queen for her hand in marriage:

> Rosélie est à vous, possédez sa beauté,
> Et je serai, madame, à votre majesté,
> Si je dois espérer d'obtenir cette gloire,
> Si des crimes passés vous perdez la mémoire. (Rotrou, p. 511)

Pâris, who had lost both Rosélie and the queen, accepted the queen's offer of her relative, Florinée. The tragi-comedy thus ends with plans for a triple marriage, and a lamentation by the two servants, Ogier and Argant, on their own fate.

Rotrou's tragi-comedy has thus proven to be an adaptation of two comedias by Lope. The author omits all but the essential action, thus simplifying the plot to conform to the more classical taste of the French audience of the early seventeenth century.

Boisrobert's "L'Heureux Desespoir"

"L'Heureux Desespoir" is the first nouvelle of Boisrobert's Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses published in 1657. The action is set in Granada. The major characters are the king, Almanzor; Cherisse, the queen (or princess) to whom the king was betrothed. Boisrobert indiscriminately utilizes both titles; Alabez, the king's ambassador sent for Cherisse; Darache, the woman chosen by the king to marry

Alabez; Prince Abindare, the king's brother in love with Darache; Almazan, Darache's brother.

The romanesque atmosphere and characters of Moorish names produce a nouvelle similar in mood to Boisrobert's Histoire indienne published in 1629. Boisrobert utilizes the basic plot of Rotrou's Heureuse Constance, but ornaments, supplements, and sensationalizes it in such a fashion as to be almost unrecognizable. To summarize elements utilized by Boisrobert that are drawn from Rotrou's tragi-comedy: The king is on the verge of marrying a queen whom he has not yet seen when, disguised as a peasant, he sees a beautiful woman, similarly disguised, and is stricken by her beauty. He subsequently orders his brother, who is also in love with this same woman to relieve him of his obligation to the queen. The brother agrees to comply but resorts to a ruse in which he switches identities with a subject in order to remain faithful to his first love. His inherent nobility cannot however be disguised, and the queen falls in love with him and not his regally dressed subject. The concluding episodes of the nouvelle bear little if any resemblance to Rotrou's plot.

The following pages will examine Boisrobert's nouvelle in detail in order to illustrate the extent of his borrowings and to determine whether his tale contains any awareness of the Spanish sources utilized by Rotrou.

Darache, who was young and beautiful, was nonetheless too far beneath the prince's rank to be his wife. Her brother was therefore concerned by the attention this prince had shown her, the more so upon learning that she was secretly corresponding with him. Almazan was thus eager to encourage the execution of the marriage with Alabez

proposed by the king. The prince was desolate at this news, and disguised himself as a gardener in order to gain entrance to Darache's garden. Unaware of his identity or presence, he overheard her sighs and avowal of love for him. The prince responded in kind. Darache at first thought her imagination had deceived her, but a moment later the prince was at her feet. After having expressed their love in typically romanesque fashion, the prince pledged that he would persuade the king to give her to him in marriage: "Enfin croyez que pour m'asseurer l'honeur de vostre possession, il n'y a point d'entreprise que ie ne fasse ny d'extremité où ie ne me porte." ("L'Heureux Desespoir," p. 21) Upon departing, the two lovers made plans to meet again the following day. In view of the difficulty and danger of these secret rendez-vous, Darache informed the prince of a tournament which would take place in two months. At this time he would be able to see her incognito, as her brother would surely forbid her attendance. The prince was discouraged by such a long wait, and hoped to be able to break her engagement with Alabez and assure their own before this time. One means to this end was to prevent the king's marriage to the queen, Cherisse. Cherisse was of the same lineage as Alabez, who had proposed this union to the king, and had consequently been rewarded with the promise of Darache's hand in marriage.

To Abindare's misfortune, the queen was determined to marry King Almanzor, as she was more attracted to Spain than to Africa, her second choice, and had further learned of the king's handsome appearance. Alabez was magnificently received upon returning with the news of her acceptance. The prince realized the futility of asking the king for Darache's hand, which had already been promised to Alabez. After

having examined all the obstacles, he concluded that his only hope was that of Darache's brother, Almazan, to whom he would offer his sister, the princess Zeline, in marriage.

The day of the tournament arrived, and Darache's brother ordered her to stay home. She succeeded, however, in persuading her attendant to accompany her in the disguise of a peasant. The king, similarly disguised, saw her and fell hopelessly in love:

> il falut que ce beau visage, au charme duquel le Prince son frere n'auoit pû resister, fust fatal à toute la maison Royale, Et que ce Roy qui iusques là n'auoit point esprouué la force d'amour, cedast tout à coup à sa puissance. (Boisrobert, p. 44)

As Darache prepared to leave, the king approached her. He purported to have recognized a nobility and grace above that befitting her peasant attire. Upon seeing her brother, Darache fled with her attendant. The king quickly informed Almazan of his passion and ordered him to follow. Unlike Rotrou's Timandre, who attempted to discourage the king's passion, Almazan was quite content to perform a comparable service. He overtook the veiled Darache and proceeded in his attempt to persuade her to give herself to the king. Lifting her veil, she angrily denounced her brother for accepting such a base commission. Similar to Timandre, the decision adopted by Almazan as the result of this second royal suitor was to hasten Darache's marriage to Alabez. Darache's response was the same as that of Rosélie: She declared herself willing to follow her brother's wishes blindly:

> Darache qui estoit bien aise de retourner à Grenade luy dit qu'il la trouuerroit tousiours disposée à suiure aueuglement ses volontez. (Boisrobert, p. 54)

Boisrobert's king is initially far more sensual than is the king of L'Heureuse Constance. Whereas Rotrou's king spoke of love, beauty, adulation, and enchantment, Boisrobert's king was preoccupied with his own pleasure and enjoyment. However, upon Almazan's return with the news that the beautiful woman was his sister who was promised to Alabez and sought by the prince, the king honorably assured him that his intention was to make her queen. Almazan counseled the king as to the wisdom of this decision in view of his existing engagement and the possibility of war were he to scorn the queen. The king was not to be dissuaded. The prince was rightfully troubled by this new turn of events, but was assured by Darache of her constant devotion:

> il ne laissoit pas de trembler dans la crainte de ce peril, parmy les tentations que donnoit vne Couronne, mais il fut bien tost guery de toutes ses defiances quand sa belle maistresse l'eut asseuré, que quand le Roy seroit libre encore, & en estat de se choisir vne femme, & que mesme il auroit assez d'amour pour la vouloir faire couronner, elle renonceroit à cette glorieuse affection pour s'arrêter à la sienne, & que s'il se sentoit assez constant pour perseuerer en l'amour qu'il luy auoit promise, elle mespriseroit pour luy toutes les Couronnes de la terre. (Boisrobert, p. 66)

At this moment the king unexpectedly arrived, discovering Darache and his brother together. The prince boldly asked for her hand; the king haughtily refused. The conversation which follows is not adapted from Rotrou's tragi-comedy. The king asked Darache whom she preferred. She replied that were the decision hers, she would not hesitate in her choice, but that her brother was master of her conduct. Almazan, however, loved the king's honor and his country enough not to risk their sacrifice, and his own honor too much to suffer the dishonor of his house. The king was in no mood to listen to rationality or

tolerate the amorous glances of the two lovers, and ordered the prince's departure. As he attempted to persuade Darache in his favor, the ambassador arrived to announce the success of his mission. Although alerted to the king's violent passion, Alabez could not believe that a king who had until this point appeared so wise and just would violate his promise to this beautiful queen. The king listened to his praise of the queen with an extreme indifference. In Rotrou, as in Lope, the letter sent by the king to his ambassador directing him to return the queen to her country occurred in a separate scene following their meeting. This lapse of time allowed for the speculation that the ambassador's excessive praise had caused the king's refusal, hence the title of Lope's comedia, Mirad a quién alabáis. Boisrobert condenses these two events into one scene, thereby leaving no doubt that the king's decision had been definitively reached before the ambassador's arrival:

> Enfin aprés que le Roy eut encore gardé le silence quelque temps sans pouuoir cacher l'agitation qu'il souffroit dans l'ame il tire de sa poche vn papier cachetté de son sceau, & le donnant à Alabez, voila vos ordres dit-il executez les bien si vous m'aimez, & en mesme temps il se retire. (Boisrobert, p. 79)

Alabez was infuriated by the king's affront to the queen and even more so by that to himself, and urged Almazan to conclude his marriage to Darache. Meanwhile, the prince, who had been ordered not to see Darache, visited her by means of a secret door. The king's spies alerted him to this fact and he paid a surprise visit to Darache, who quickly hid the prince in a closet. The king threatened to behead the prince if they did not obey his will. At these words, the enraged

prince opened the closet door and defended himself with just accusations which resulted in his imprisonment. The king subsequently asked Darache's brother for counsel, and he too pointed out the impracticality, dishonor, as well as grave danger of the king's actions. The wisdom of Almazan's remonstrances calmed the king's anger but not his passion.

In Lope, the threat of war was only a pretext; in Rotrou, never imminent. Boisrobert makes it an ominous probability. The king's direct confrontation of the two lovers, and the subsequent rebellion by the prince are details without precedent in Rotrou or his Spanish sources. His schizophrenic transformation from violent rage to gentle moderation and deceptive persuasion is also an innovation: "Ils ne changerent toutefois que son stile & son visage, de violente & d'emporté qu'il estoit auparauant, il leur parut doux & modere." (Boisrobert, pp. 101-102) Although his style differs, the king's decision to bequeath his rights to the queen to his brother was also the response of Rotrou's king:

> le Prince mõ frere est plus digne que moy de la possession de cette grande Princesse, allez le deliurer de ce pas, & luy dittes que s'il me veut bien ceder la belle Darache, non seulement ie luy cede les pretentions que i'ay à la Reine de Fez: Mais ie luy cede encore vne partie de mes Estats auecque ses deux Couronnes. (Boisrobert, pp. 103-104)

Rotrou's ambassador had been promised Rosélie by her brother and not by the king as is the case in Boisrobert. As compensation for his revocation, the king thus offered his two sisters in marriage to Alabez and Amandez.

The gift of the king's sisters satisfied both subjects, who were

able to persuade the prince to relinquish Darache at least in appearance as the queen would certainly resist this substitution. The queen was initially enraged by the king's affront, but was subdued by Alabez's flattering portrait of the prince. Having previously heard of the prince's noble actions and handsome appearance, the queen agreed to accept him provided his person pleased her as much as his reputation. The prince pretended to be satisfied when this news was relayed to him, but secretly persuaded a charming but unattractive gentleman who was accompanying him to take his place:

> Le Prince feint d'estre bien aise de cette nouuelle & comme il apprend qu'il est demandé tout seul, n'ayant amené auec luy qu'vn Gentil-homme qui estoit d'agreable compagnie, & qui le diuertissoit fort par les charmes de son esprit: mais qui n'estoit guere agreable de visage. (Boisrobert, p. 129)

This role differs from that of the gracioso and servant found in Rotrou and his Spanish sources. Indeed, in Lope's Poder vencido it was the servant Colín who cleverly proposed the substitution. Boisrobert emphasizes that even with their exchange of clothing, the true prince was still discernible from the false. Upon his entry into the queen's chambers, she was surprised by both his appearance and actions:

> Son estonnement redoubla lorsque ce Prince feint s'emporta d'abord à des libertez qu'elle trouua trop familieres, & que portant insensiblement à dessein cette conversation dans l'extrauagance, il donna vn degoust à cette Princesse qu'elle ne put plus dissimuler. (Boisrobert, p. 136)

She was unable to disguise her disgust, and curtly acknowledged that she would inform his envoy of her sentiments. Upon seeing this envoy, the queen was captivated by his charms and wished that he were

the prince. After having regained her composure, she haughtily refused the exchange the king had sent her, and vowed she would avenge this insult. He had barely left her chambers when she asked him to return, and in the conversation which ensued, she clearly expressed her passion for him. As he did not, however, respond, and as she was too passionately stricken not to flatter herself with hope, she concluded that she had not explained herself well. She therefore sent for Alabez to further inquire as to the envoy's birth. She soon discovered that the prince and his envoy had exchanged clothing, and recognized that she had been twice duped: "Il n'en falloit pas dire davantage pour faire connoistre à la Reine qu'on l'auoit trompée, & qu'elle receuoit des affrons de tous les costez." (Boisrobert, p. 149)

Infuriated by this second insult, she angrily announced her intention to capture the city. When the king learned of this new development followed by the queen's message that she would leave the kingdom in peace provided she received the prince, not only he but the entire kingdom begged the prince to appease her anger. Abindare stubbornly refused, preferring to see both himself and his country perish rather than renounce Darache. Only upon Darache's threat to stab herself if he did not submit to the the queen's demands did the prince agree to this union: "ouy, ouy ie vous veux sauer quoy qu'il arriue, mais souuenez vous belle Darache que vous exigez plus de moy que vous ne pensez." (Boisrobert, p. 158) None of the above melodramatic romanesque scenes, nor any of those that follow is to be found in Rotrou.

Abindare appeared before the queen and confessed that his body was at her disposal, but that his soul belonged to Darache. With

these words, he stabbed himself in the stomach. In this anguished state, the prince told her of his love for Darache. He then fainted, and the queen followed suit. They both recovered, and frightened by the gravity of his condition, the queen sent for Darache who was brought in spite of the king's obstinate refusal. The moment the queen saw Darache's beautiful face, she forgave both prince and king for having loved her. Boisrobert's depiction of the prince's suffering, of Darache's melancholic beauty, and the extremity of their love is melodramatic and unrealistic, as the following passage illustrates:

> En disant ces paroles elle la mene au lit du blessé, qui surpris de cette visite impreueue sentit vne extraordinaire agitation, elle se trouua si grande & si violente que sans qu'il portast, comme il auoit desia fait plusieurs fois, la main à son appareil, la playe se r'ouurit d'elle mesme,& comme il se voulut escrier, ah! belle Darache, ce beau nom fut entrecouppé par sa defaillance, & n'en prononça que la moitié, on courut aux remedes & aux Medecins qui sur la connoissance qu'ils prirent de la cause de cette Syncope, ordonnerent qu'on luy ostast promptement cet object de deuant les yeux. (Boisrobert, pp. 170-171)

The queen, touched by this excessive love made in heaven, promised the prince not only Darache but the crown of Granada were he to recover:

> cette vnion que ie voy que le Ciel a faitte, est trop forte & trop belle, je ne m'y veux plus opposer, bien loin de la rompre, j'en veux establir la seureté, & si vous guerissez, Prince ie vous donne auec Darache la Couronne de Grenade. (Boisrobert, p. 173)

Her only request was that the prince have the following inscription engraved on the gates of the Alhambra: "Cherisse Reine de Fez pouuoit regner dans Grenade; / Mais elle à [sic] mieux aimé regner sur ses passions." (Boisrobert, p. 177)

Unlike Rotrou or the Spanish comedias, the king does not now fall in love with the queen at first sight. On the contrary, Boisrobert states that he reigned conjointly with his brother, but abstained from ever conversing with Darache in private. The king only survived his extreme loss and misfortune for six months, but before his death concluded the marriages of his two sisters with Almazan and Alabez. Boisrobert purports to have received from their descendants this story: "dans laquelle on doit admirer la constante amour du Prince Abindare & son heureux desespoir." (Boisrobert, p. 179)

Conclusion. Boisrobert's nouvelle adapts only the basic plot summary from Rotrou's L'Heureuse Constance. The change in title to L'Heureux Desespoir is without doubt a more accurate description not only of his suicidal protagonist, but of all his despairing, love-stricken characters who are at the total mercy of their passions. As concerns this attempted suicide and Boisrobert's source, Hainsworth states the following:

> Boisrobert's most notable addition to the plot is the attempted suicide of the hero, which gives the title its meaning. The author seems to have directed his main efforts towards disguising the theme, as it stood in Rotrou, by transplanting it from Hungary and Dalmatia to Granada and by replacing the noms à la grecque by appropriate Moorish forms.[6]

Boisrobert did indeed disguise his theme well, and although the borrowings are, as Hainsworth points out, too striking to be disregarded (Hainsworth, p. 147), the romanesque sensationalization of the basic plot is much closer to his own Histoire indienne than to Rotrou's tragi-comedy. Analogous to the Histoire indienne, the characters in

this nouvelle always recognize nobility even if disguised. The king instantly knew that the peasant-clad Darache was of noble birth; the queen immediately rejected the regally dressed subject in favor of the disguised prince. In the article quoted above, Hainsworth suggests the need for further research to determine whether Boisrobert went back to Rotrou's sources. (Hainsworth, p. 147) The present study conclusively establishes that he did not. No episodes found in the two comedias by Lope other than those found in Rotrou's Heureuse Constance are reproduced by Boisrobert. Had he had recourse to these comedias, perhaps he could have produced a more readable version than the "L'Heureux Desespoir." As it stands, this is certainly the weakest of his nouvelles, and lacks the quality not only of Rotrou's tragi-comedy but of his own Histoire indienne.

Notes

[1] François le Métel, Abbé de Boisrobert, "Epistre à Monseigneur Fouquet," Les Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses (Paris: P. Lamy, 1657), n. p.

[2] George Hainsworth, "New Details on the 'Nouvelles' of Scarron and Boisrobert," Bulletin Hispanique, (1947), p. 145.

[3] Lope de Vega, El Poder vencido y amor premiado, in Obras dramáticas (Madrid: Rivadeneyra, S. A., 1930), vol. VIII, p. 530-568.

[4] Lope de Vega, Mirad a quién alabáis, in Obras dramáticas (Madrid: Galo Saez, 1930), vol. XIII, pp. 28-59.

[5] Jean Rotrou, L'Heureuse Constance, in Oeuvres (Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1967), vol. II, pp. 429-512.

[6] George Hainsworth, "New Details on the 'Nouvelles' of Scarron and Boisrobert," Bulletin Hispanique, (1947), p. 146.

Chapter 5

THE SECOND NOUVELLE: "L'INCESTE SUPPOSE"

"L'Inceste supposé" is the second nouvelle in Boisrobert's Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses. It is based on "La Perseguida triunfante" of María de Zayas, the ninth novela, or night, in the second part of the Novelas amorosas y exemplares, entitled the Desengaños amorosos. This chapter will first look at each work in detail. The two major aims in studying these works will be to determine the extent of originality in Boisrobert's adaptation, if it is indeed to be viewed as such, and to demonstrate the distinct cultural differences exhibited within the works. This chapter proposes to utilize these two stories in order to illustrate clearly the tremendous divergence between the two societies.

"La perseguida triunfante"

"La Perseguida triunfante," or the "noche novena" of María de Zayas is preceded by a discussion among the group which has gathered in the home of Lisis to hear and relate tales of love and deception. The author takes this opportunity to interject her own views on womanhood: "que bien necio es el que no dice bien, ni estima las mujeres a la buena, porque lo es, y a la mala, por no parecer descortés y

necio."[1] A tone of pessimism and negativism towards male-female relationships is revealed by the author in the verses sung by the beautiful doña Isabel: "mas Anarda ingrate / de sus penas se rió, que ha jurado de no amar / en tiempo que no hay amor." (Zayas, p. 338) The tale of this ninth evening is related by doña Estefanía who claims that like the devil, who as the father of deceit often undeceives, she, being of the profession of those who deceive, will also undeceive. (Zayas, p. 339)

The setting of her illustrative tale is Hungary. At the death of King Ladislao, his son, also named Ladislao came to power. This son was a generous, brave prince who was immediately loved by his vassals. Wishing to give his kingdom heirs, the king sought in marriage the hand of Beatriz, the beautiful daughter of the king of England. Ladislao sent Federico, his galant and discrete younger brother to bring the queen-to-be from England. Upon seeing Beatriz, Federico fell hopelessly in love. He initially attempted to resist the violence of his passion, but each time he regarded the perfect beauty of the queen, his resistance fled, and he bitterly lamented: "¡Oh Ladislao, ya no hermano, sino enemigo!" (Zayas, p. 342) For her part, the queen was astutely aware of Federico's sentiments, and consequently ordered her attendants never to leave her alone for a single instant. Upon arriving in Hungary, the wedding of Ladislao and Beatriz was celebrated with much happiness and satisfaction by both parties. Federico's passion increased to a ravaging jealousy upon seeing the tenderness shared by the newly wed couple. The naive king assumed his brother's extreme melancholy was due to a grave illness, and to no avail procured the most famous doctors to treat him, "sin fruto,

porque males del alma pocas veces o ninguna se sanan con hacer remedios al cuerpo." (Zayas, p. 343)

Federico became increasingly thin and flaccid. When after a year, war was initiated by a neighboring prince desiring to extend his kingdom, the king recognized that his brother was incapable of fighting, and was himself forced to defend his land. He left the government of his kingdom in the hands of Federico and Beatriz. Immediately upon the departure of the king, Federico began to subtly portray signs of his passion to the queen. He indirectly declared his love to her, and left a letter among the briefs she was reading. He declared that he would die because of her beauty, and by his death she would know the quality of his pain:

> Y ya que haya de morir, muera sabiendo tú que muero por tu causa, y por este atrevimiento conocerás la calidad de mi dolor, pues no me dexa mirar a quien eres y a quien soy . . . me fuerza a que publique que tu hermosura es causa de mi muerte. Yo te adoro, ya lo dixe. Si no merezco perdón, dame castigo; que le sufriré gustoso con saber que muero por ti." (Zayas, p. 348)

Having read the letter, the queen angrily tore it into pieces. She decided to disregard it, and ordered her governess to stay by her side night and day. The prince interpreted her silence as a gain for him, and subsequently dared to express his love to her, to dress in her colors, and to have musicians proclaim her cruelty in serenade, as exemplified by the following verses:

> Si te miro, es sin gusto;
> siempre cruel te veo;
> siempre estás desdeñosa,
> y yo siempre muriendo. (Zayas, p. 352)

After having listened to these verses, the irate queen determined to have a cage constructed and placed in the garden of the palace. Its only contents were a small bed, a desk, and a chair. She then enticed Federico to enter, locked the door, and informed him that he would remain entrapped until the return of her husband: "--Ahi estarás, principe, hasta que venga el rey, tu hermano, porque de otra suerte, ni tu dexarás de ser traidor, ni yo perseguida, ni el honor de mi esposo puede estar seguro." (Zayas, p. 355) Federico's love immediately turned to hatred and rage. He ate only enough to remain alive, and refused to change clothes, shave, or sleep. He remained in the cage for more than a year, and thus became so thin and disfigured that he was almost unrecognizable. Upon the eve of the king's return, the queen set him free. Without a word to her, he ordered a horse and went immediately to the king, in the form, not of a gentleman and prince, but in that of a savage, a living skeleton, a fantastic vision. His emaciated condition, plus the element of truth involved, lent great credibility to the tale he related to the king. He told his brother that the queen had kept him imprisoned in an iron cage like a wild beast, rationing his food, refusing to allow him to cut his beard or hair or to change clothes, because he had scorned her lascivious love. (Zayas, p. 358) Confronted with the flaccid presence of his brother, not only the king, but the majority of his soldiers believed Federico's story. María de Zayas inserts her own negative commentary on man's overly zealous credibility in too easily condemning an innocent female:

Gran falta en un rey, que si ha de guardar justicia, si da

> un oído a la acusación, ha de dar otro a la defensa della. Mas era el acusador su hermano, y la acusada su esposa; el traidor, un hombre, y la comprendida en ella, una mujer, que aunque más inocente esté, ninguno cree su inocencia, y más marido, que con este nombre se califica de enemigo. (Zayas, p. 360)

In spite of the queen's unjustified cruelty to her brother-in-law, the author voices approval of her actions and defends the sanctity of the "santa y hermosísima Beatriz," (Zayas, p. 360) while seeing no justification whatsoever in the retributory actions of her husband. Upon entering her room the king raised his hand and slapped his wife with such cruelty and force, that bathed in her "innocent" blood, she fell to his feet. Then without listening to her, he ordered that her eyes be extracted and that she be left to perish at the clutches of wild beasts, or of hunger and sadness, in the most barren and uninhabited mountains in the kingdom. (Zayas, pp. 361-362) The author bitterly moralizes as she relates the execution by the king's soldiers of his orders: "Luego, hasta en sacarle los ojos, cumplieron éstos con el oficio de hombres contra esta mujer, como hacen ahora todos con todas." (Zayas, p. 363)

Shortly after their departure, the queen's sight was miraculously restored by a beautiful woman. When asked her identity by Beatriz, the woman responded that she was a friend whom Beatriz had seen many times: "--Soy una amiga tuya--respondió la señora--, y la verdad es que me has visto muchas veces; mas por ahora no conviene que sepas más de mí que lo que ves." (Zayas, p. 365) The woman left her with the assurance that within a few days, someone would arrive to offer her repose. True to her words, within a short period of time, Beatriz was discovered by a nobleman of German tongue. He told her she was in

Germany, and that he was the Duke Octavio. He welcomed her as a brother, and assured her that she would be well received by the duchess, his wife.

Meanwhile, Federico had determined to go in search of the queen in order to rape and murder her. Unsuccessful in this task, and burning with wrath at not having been able to find her, he had just sat down on a large rock when there appeared before him an ugly man of approximately forty years, dressed as a scholar and carrying a book. He claimed to be a magician, and informed Federico that he had seen him many times. He offered to aid him in accomplishing his desires on one condition: that Federico never divulge this secret. He then informed the prince that Beatriz was alive and well. The two men returned to the court in Hungary, where the evil doctor quickly gained the love of the king by curing him of a serious illness. He gave Federico a magical ring with the power to convert his lies into truths, and to metamorphosize his appearance so as to be unrecognized by others. A year had passed when one day the doctor told Federico that the time had come to make war against Beatriz. They left the court in Hungary, and with the aid of the doctor's demoniacal powers, arrived at the German palace where Beatriz was sheltered. With the fabrication of a false letter, they succeeded in having Beatriz ousted from the palace, and returned to the fountain where the duke had found her. Federico arrived and was voicing threats to rape and murder her, when with the appearance of the beautiful lady, he found himself embracing a wild lion. The lady guided Beatriz to some shepherds' cabins, and directed her to remain there. The emperor, the empress, and their six year old son were passing by, saw Beatriz, recognized

that she was Hungarian, and stopped to speak. The child flung himself at Beatriz, and adoringly embraced her. He protested so violently when his parents tried to disengage him, that they invited Beatriz, whom they were to call Florinda, to live in their palace to serve as his guardian. Federico, meanwhile, was furious with the queen for having endangered his life. The doctor was at a loss as to the identity of the mysterious lady defending Beatriz, and could only warn Federico that if Beatriz did not die within a year, their lives would be in grave danger. Federico determined to murder the child, and entering the room where both he and Beatriz slept, he stabbed the child, leaving the bloody dagger in the hands of Beatriz. Upon their discovery, the emperor presumed her guilty and ordered her beheaded. A third time, Beatriz was saved by her guardian angel. She was taken to the mouth of a cave, and told that this would be her temporary residence. In the meantime, the child suddenly revived, and loudly shouted not to kill Florinda, for she had not killed him. Federico and the doctor decided that their only recourse was to return to Hungary, and if unsuccessful in working against Beatriz, they would have to murder the king.

Beatriz lived quietly and contently in the cave for eight years without the evil doctor being able to discover where she was. Her only regret was to have not seen her beloved friend and defender in all these years. Early one morning, her friend unexpectedly appeared. She revealed that she was the Mother of God. Zayas once again digresses, and after praising the Mother of God's power in liberating Beatriz from a man, the author condemns the eternal plight of the helpless female at the mercy of the deceitful man:

> Veis la parienta burlada, la amiga perdida, la señora deshonrada, la plebeya sbatida, la mujer muerta a manos del marido, la hija por el padre, la hermana por el hermano; la dama por el galán, y finalmente veis que el día de hoy el mayor honor y la mayor hazaña de que se precian los hombres es de burlaros y decir mal de vosotras, sin reservar ninguna. . . . (Zayas, pp. 398-399)

The Mother of God provided Beatriz with male clothing and instructed her to return to her kingdom where a plague was ravishing the people. Only she, with the aid of an herbal potion, had the power to save, and only on condition that the ill person confessed his worst sins. If out of shame or malice, he failed to confess any sin, he would die without salvation upon drinking the potion. Beatriz departed, and soon after entering the kingdom of Hungary, by her deeds she acquired the reputation of a miraculous doctor. The king sent for her to cure his dying brother, Federico. The magical doctor was at Federico's side, and asked Beatriz by what virtue she cured. She responded by that of God, against which his false magic was useless. She then explained to Federico the conditions of his cure. Faced with death and eternal condemnation, Federico was forced to disavow his earlier promise to the evil doctor and in the king's presence, he confessed all his sins. The king bitterly lamented the injustice Beatriz had suffered. She revealed her identity, whereupon her clothing was immediately metamorphosized into the royal attire she had worn the day of her exile. The doctor, seated in a chair near Federico's bed, cried: "--¡Venciste, María, venciste! Ya conozco la sombra que amparaba a Beatriz, que hasta ahora estuve ciego," (Zayas, p. 407) and disappeared.

Ladislao initially wanted to physically enjoy his beautiful wife, but she refused, stating that she aspired only to the celestial "Esposo"

and to the kingdom of glory. She retired to a convent where she lived a saintly and long life. King Ladislao sent to England for Beatriz's younger sister, Isabela, as Federico's wife. Upon their marriage, he ceded power to his brother, and following in his wife's footsteps, he took the habit of the glorious San Benito, and lived a saintly life until his death many years before that of Beatriz.

Zayas authenticates her tale by stating that before her death, Beatriz wrote the history of her life, entitled Desengaño, which she herself saw as a child:

> pues en él ven las damas lo que deben temer, pues por la crueldad y porfía de un hombre padeció tanto trabajos la reina Beatriz, que en toda Italia es tenida por santa, donde vi su vida manuscrita, estando allá con mis padres. (Zayas, p. 409)

The "noche novena" terminates with a didactic sonnet sung by doña Isabel on the rapid degeneration of lascivious love.

"L'Inceste supposé"

Before departing for war, Ladislas, king of Hungary, delegated power to his only brother, Prince Tindare. This handsome and brave prince was unfortunately not of as strong a moral character as his position and appearance might have led one to believe. Having promised his hand in marriage to Irène, one of the queen's chambermaids, his passion rapidly diminished with the fulfillment of his desires. Irène, suspicious of her lover's unnatural melancholy, sought the cause and discovered none other than the queen, "une des plus belles & des plus sages Princesses du monde,"[2] to be the source. Although

greatly distressed at the discovery of her lover's incestuous passion, Irène took consolation in her knowledge that the virtuous queen would never cede to an adulterous liaison. To the queen, however, Irène confessed only that the prince no longer loved her, and that only her majesty the queen would be capable of discovering the true cause of her lover's chagrin. Irène did not, however, reveal the true content of a passionate monologue she had overheard in which the prince lamented his incestuous love for his brother's wife. Unaware that she was the object of the prince's passion, the queen unwittingly encouraged his love by referring to this solitary lamentation.

> Le Prince qui se souuenoit fort bien de tout ce qu'il auoit dit dans ce cabinet se trouua merueilleusement surpris de la bizarrerie de cette aduanture. . . . (Boisrobert, p. 205)

He interpreted the queen's words to his own advantage, and was completely befuddled upon hearing that she consented to his marriage to Irène. Deceived in his expectations, he stared fixedly at the ground without uttering a word:

> Pendant que la Reine parloit ainsi, le Prince qui ne s'attendoit à rien moins qu'à ce discours se voyant tout à coup décheu de ses esperances, tenoit les yeux fichez contre terre, & n'osoit plus les esleuer sur ce beau visage dont il auoit eu peu auparavant la vanité de se croire fauorisé. . . . (Boisrobert, p. 210)

The queen was no less confused by the prince's behavior, and upon learning the truth from Irène, she had great difficulty in comprehending such a bizarre and criminal love. She resolved to see him as little as possible, and above all to speak to him, only when in the presence of others. This resolution proved impossible to observe, however, as

the prince was the active regent in the absence of his brother, and state affairs forced the two together. His respect for the queen initially restrained him, but as the violence of his passion grew, he was no longer able to control his compulsion. Finally finding himself alone with the queen, the prince flung himself at her knees, ardently kissing her ungloved hand. Angered by the prince's irrational display of passion, the indignant queen warned him not to forget his place:

> Qu'est-cecy Prince, luy dit-elle; est-ce à moy que cette fureur s'addresse & que vous tesmoignez cét emportement? Si vous auez perdu la memoire de vostre naissance, si vous auez oublié ce que vous estes au Roy & ce que vous vous deuez á vous mesme, n'oubliez pas au moins qui ie suis. (Boisrobert, p. 223)

She cautioned him of the consequences were the king to discover his importunities, but assured him that she would remember nothing were he to regain his composure. The prince begged her to blame only the Heavens for his irrational conduct. The wise and beautiful queen initially felt more pity than anger for the blinded prince, and sadly recognized that he was no longer master of his reason. Her show of kindness and indulgence served only to increase the prince's extravagances, and she was forced to threaten exposure to the king upon brusquely leaving his presence. The mad prince rationalized that had the queen truly been angry, she would not have listened to him so favorably. He interpreted her kind remonstrances as signs of love, and decided that his letters would perhaps be better received than his words. He immediately wrote the queen a letter that he had delivered by his private secretary, Teralde. In this letter he expressed his

resolution to die at the hands of the enemy army unless the queen judged his life still useful for her service. He asked for fifteen minutes of her time before his departure, but only if she had some hope to give him.

Upon receiving this letter, the distressed queen resolved to show the prince no mercy, as her previous kindness had been more harmful than profitable. She immediately went to the prince, and in the cruelest of tones severely reprimanded his brutal and incestuous love. She avowed her intention to immediately write the king were he not to promise not only that he would no longer speak to her about his monstrous passion but that he also would never be in a place where she had to suffer his sight and presence:

> Ie vous dy donc Prince brutal & dénaturé, Prince incestueux, que ie vous abhorre comme vn Monstre, que ie m'en vay tout presentement escrire au Roy l'outrage que vous faites à son honneur, si vous ne me promettez non seulement de ne m'en plus parler, mais que vous ne vous trouuerez iamais en lieu où ie puisse souffrir votre veuë & vostre presence. (Boisrobert, p. 240)

The queen's words had a strange effect on the wounded prince. Mortified by her ingratitude at being treated as a goddess, he converted his love to fury, and vowed to avenge her scorn. The method of revenge came in the form of a dispatch from the king revealing his intention to surprise the queen by his arrival, and requesting that his brother meet him secretly at a designated place to inform him of the news in his kingdom.

Meanwhile, the already repentant queen confided what had transpired to Irène, who correctly suspected that vengeance would be taken by the prince, who at this very moment was carrying out his projected

revenge. Having arrived at the designated scene, the prince gravely confessed to his brother the violent passion the queen had professed for him since her husband's departure:

> Le Roy qui de temps en temps marquoit sa douleur par ses sanglots, eut le temps de se composer & de se remettre pendant vn si long discours, & sans tesmoigner dans cet instant aucun emportement contre la Reine, il se contenta de remercier le Prince son frere d'en auoir vsé de la sorte, le loüant d'auoir fait parestre en vn si dangereux rencontre, vne si extraordinaire vertu; (Boisrobert, p. 255)

The king did not question the validity of his brother's story, and instead immediately lost all esteem and tenderness for his wife. In an instant, he passed from love to hate, and without a word to his brother, cruelly resolved to have the queen executed by his faithful servant Ramese. He wrote a letter to the queen, asking that she meet him incognito at a home he had outside the city, accompanied only by Irène. Ramese was ordered to take the queen for a walk in the forest, where he would then stab her. Upon arriving at the designated area, Ramese relayed his orders to the queen. She promised that she would offer no resistance to the king's orders, and asked only that he tell her the crime she had committed. Ramese told her that it was the prince who had accused her. She showed him the letter the prince had written to her, and with the aid of this letter and the innocence portrayed on the queen's face, Ramese knew that she had been unjustly accused. They decided to teach the overly credulous king a lesson for his haste in ordering the queen's death, and with the aid of Irène, they prepared a casket for the queen.

Having returned to the king, Ramese lamented his murder of the innocent queen. As proof of her innocence, he showed the king the

prince's letter which he claimed to have taken from the dead queen's body. Upon overhearing these words, the enraged prince madly attacked Ramese and would have strangled him to death had the king not interfered. He confessed his guilt to the king, stating that he alone was culpable, and chastizing the king for his credulity. Stricken by this cruel confession, the king fainted, and the prince unsuccessfully attempted to committ suicide by flinging himself upon a guard's sword. The prince demanded death. The king agreed, not because his brother requested death, but because he merited it.

In the meantime, the queen, who had received this news from her faithful servants, decided the time had come to be resuscitated. Irène wrote a letter delivered to the king by Ramese stating that the queen's wound was not mortal, and that she had regained consciousness. The king was then brought to the court, where he learned the truth from Ramese and Irène. The queen forgave his precipitation in condemning her on false appearances, and the king swore never again to be credulous, and to be constant in loving and honoring the queen until death:

> Allons dit le Roy, allons Madame, vous m'allez voir jurer au pied des Autels que ie ne seray iamais credule, & que ie seray Constant à vous aimer & à vous honorer iusques à la mort. (Boisrobert, p. 307)

The prince obtained the king's pardon, but only on the queen's condition that he marry Irène.

Adaptation or Original Creation? "L'Inceste supposé" is a rather free adaptation of María de Zayas' "La Perseguida triunfante." Boisrobert utilizes the basic plot of the Spanish novela, but adapts it

to the French taste in such a manner that it bears only the slightest resemblance in both form and content to the original. Instead of an eclectic magical and mysterious tale catering to the senses, the French nouvelle portrays an almost classical appeal to the reason and intellect, amidst a romanesque background which attempts to be historical. Boisrobert's nouvelle follows a plausible pattern of cause and effect based on the king's one character flaw--credulity. As the direct result of this flaw, the king is made to suffer, but at the end recognizes his error, repents, and vows never again to form a judgment based on false appearances. The tale is thus a kind of fable in which experience teaches the rejection of a false tenet and the acquisition of a sound moral value. There is no element of supernatural or divine intervention, the roles in the Spanish original of both the Mother of God and magician being omitted.

Zayas' tale exhibits no plausible cause and effect patterns, and is on the contrary based on religious morality and supernatural intervention. The element of credulity Boisrobert presents as the basic theme in "L'Inceste supposé" is manifest to only a minor degree in Zayas' "Perseguida triunfante." As in Boisrobert's adaptation, the king naively believes a false appearance, but here his hasty decision is justified by the overwhelming evidence lending credibility to this appearance. Zayas' condemnation of the king's credulity is presented not as the basic theme, but as a means to insert her Manichaean moralizations on the evil of the masculine sex. A. de Amezúa contends that María de Zayas' novelas were written with two ends in mind: to defend women and to draw an exemplary moral from her narration.[3] This is clearly the case in "La Perseguida triunfante." The prevailing theme

throughout this novela is, as the title indicates, that of the persecuted woman, and the exemplary moral that of the triumph of good over evil. Zayas' morality is a Christian morality based on her profound religious faith, but permeated with a distinctive element of Manichaeanism: women are viewed as good and perfect; men, as evil and deceiving. This particular novela exhibits an extreme negativism towards the possibility of the existence of love with the opposite sex, "en tiempo que no hay amor." (Zayas, p. 338)

There is a discernible difference in tone between the first and second parts of Zayas' Novelas, as many scholars have observed. The second part, which includes "La Perseguida triunfante" is noticeably more pessimistic and negative, especially as concerns the masculine sex:

> Celles-ci, qui seraient, à en croire l'auteur, strictement vraies, sont toutes destinées à montrer la méchanceté du sexe masculin, et leurs données, assassinats, viols, vices contre nature, envoûtements, ont en général un caractère tragique ou macabre.[4]

The retributory action the queen takes against her brother-in-law for his persistence in pursuing her is far in excess of any injustice he had committed. Federico's only crime was that of passionately loving her, and because of this love, she imprisoned him in an iron cage as if he were, in his own words, a wild beast: "me ha tenido en una jaula de hierro, como león o tigre, o otra bestia fiera. . . ." (Zayas, p. 358)

In Boisrobert's nouvelle, the prince's wrath is spontaneously provoked by the queen's justified cruelty in scorning his love after the failure of more pacific means. His mad vengeance is the product,

not of a year's imprisonment in an iron cage, but of a mere verbal rejection:

> Ces paroles menassantes imprimerent une frayeur mortelle en l'ame du Prince, & les rudes termes dont elle venoit d'user peu auparavant firent un estrange bouleuersement dans son coeur, quoy dit il en luy-mesme, femme ingrate? Parce que ie vous traitte de Deesse, vous me regarderez comme vn mortel miserable . . . en disant ces paroles la fureur s'empara tout à coup de son esprit, il ne medita plus que ressentiment & que vengeance. (Boisrobert, pp. 241-243)

The prince's vengeance in Boisrobert's nouvelle is by no means justified by the queen's actions toward him, and can be attributed solely to his own madness. In Zayas' tale, on the other hand, Federico's vengeance is totally justified in view of the heinous actions taken against him by the queen. The author does not, however, acknowledge the justification of any retributory actions against the saintly Beatriz for having so aptly defended her honor, and will thus call upon a divine intervention, in the form of a beautiful woman, to correct the evil man has committed against this perfect queen. The events comprising the greater portion of the work will thus pit the supernatural forces of evil, in the form of man, against the divine forces of good, in the form of woman. Beatriz will be protected by her guardian angel, the Mother of God; Federico, aided in his evil designs by the magical and demoniacal doctor.

None of these events is reproduced in Boisrobert's tale, where vengeance remains tightly confined within the realm of human possibilty, and in reality is only staged. In Zayas, the revenge is realized but subsequently counteracted by means of divine intervention. Federico exhibits not the slightest remorse at the vengeance he has evoked in

the king, and on the contrary takes great pleasure in his accomplishment. Once the order has been given to abandon the sightless queen in a remote mountain area, he desires to pursue her only in order to rape and kill her.

In Boisrobert's version, the prince's wrath against the queen disappears as quickly as it had emerged. He had no sooner accused her before the king than he repented his actions: "il crut voir quelque chose de fort funeste dans ses yeux, qui marquoit sa mort & se repentit de l'auoir si iniustement accusée." (Boisrobert, p. 256) As for the king, his love was also converted spontaneously into aversion upon hearing his brother's accusatory words: "dés qu'il eut perdu son estime, il perdit toute sa tendresse; il passa dans un instant de l'amour à l'auersion." (Boisrobert, p. 258) The succeeding events bear no resemblance to Zayas' novela. Believing the queen dead as a result of the prince's accusation and the king's orders, the two brothers are stricken with grief. Her death is, however, only a ruse to punish the king's precipitation in ordering her execution, and the tale ends happily with all lovers reconciled and the king's promise never again to form a hasty decision based on false appearances.

Zayas' novela, on the other hand, proceeds with a series of supernatural attempts by Federico and the evil doctor to destroy Beatriz, each hindered by the divine intervention of the Mother of God. Some ten years pass between the queen's exile from court and her final resurgence. During this period of time, she expresses no sorrow at not being with her husband. On the contrary, after having lived eight years in the cave, reference is made to the fact that she did not remember him, "ya no se le acordaba de reino, ni esposo. . . ." and

that her only regret was to have not seen her beloved defender in all these years:

> Sólo sentía mucha pena de no haber visto en todos estos años su amada amiga y defensora, aquella hermosa señora a quien tanto debía, que casi amara el verse en peligro por tonarla a ver. (Zayas, p. 397)

When finally returned to her kingdom, Beatriz refuses any reconciliatory reunion with her husband, and not wishing to spend even one night in the palace, she immediately goes to a convent. All Federico's evil deeds are apparently absolved with his confession, and in actuality, he is the character who appears to have gained the most. Beatriz and Ladislao retire to their respective convent and abbey; Federico inherits the kingdom and gains the hand of Beatriz's beautiful sister in marriage.

Conclusion. As stated above, the two tales are only remotely related, containing no similarity in tone and action, and are only mildly similar in plot and structure. Boisrobert relies on Zayas' basic setting and structure as a point of departure, but adapts his nouvelle in such a way as to create a totally new and different story. Even in the rare instances when he translates key phrases, the cultural differences are too great to evoke equivalent sentiments. The best example concerns the famous "Soy quien soy" phrase seen repeatedly in seventeenth-century Spanish literature, and utilized by Zayas in the form of Federico's lament to Beatriz: "pues no me dexa mirar a quien eres y a quien soy." (Zayas, p. 348) Boisrobert's "n'oubliez pas au moins qui ie suis . . ." (Boisrobert, p. 223)

employed by the queen to her brother-in-law simply does not have the same connotation. The French nouvelle is intellectual, rational, and portrays elements of both the romanesque and the classical. The action is simple, concentrated and plausible, but also exaggerated and psychologically undeveloped. The Spanish work is emotional, irrational, and baroque. The action is complex, extended over a period of years, and based on supernatural and divine "coup de foudres," with characters metamorphosing, disappearing, and resuscitating. The French tale appeals to the intellect and reason; the Spanish, to the emotions and senses. The two are above all exemplifications of their respective cultural values, and the effect these values had on literary production.

Notes

[1] María de Zayas y Sotomayor. "La Perseguida triunfante," Desengaños amorosos: Parte segunda del sarao y entretenimiento honesto de Doña María de Zayas y Sotomayor, ed. Agustín G. de Amezúa y Mayo (Madrid: Aldus, S. A. de Artes Gráficas, 1950), p. 334.

[2] François le Métel, Abbé de Boisrobert. "L'Inceste supposé," Les Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses (Paris: P. Lamy, 1657), p. 184.

[3] María de Zayas y Sotomayor, Novelas amorosas y ejemplares, ed. Agustín G. de Amezúa (Madrid: Aldus, S. A. de Artes Gráficas, 1948), p. xxxiii.

[4] G. Hainsworth, Les "Novelas exemplares" de Cervantes en France au XVII[e] siècle (1933; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971), p. 175.

Chapter 6

THE THIRD NOUVELLE: "PLUS D'EFFETS QUE DE PAROLES"

Scarron's "Plus d'effets que de paroles," the fourth tale of his Nouvelles tragi-comiques, was first published in 1656. Boisrobert's nouvelle of the same title appeared in the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses published in 1657. Boisrobert's tale, like that of Scarron, is an adaptation of Tirso de Molina's Palabras y Plumas. Scarron's tale utilizes material provided by Tirso, but is in some ways an original creation. Although not an exact translation, Boisrobert's text follows the original more closely than do the two preceding adaptations. Several of the more notable changes include the variation in form from the comedia in verse to the nouvelle in prose, a variation already present in Scarron; the omission of the gracioso; and the omission of the hunger and poverty scenes.

As discussed in Chapter 3 of this study, Scarron and Boisrobert had been embroiled in a quarrel since 1654 when both authors staged their respective adaptations of Rojas' Obligados e offendidos, y Gorron de Salamanca. This dispute was further aggravated when d'Ouville similarly translated a novela by Zayas that Scarron had adapted in his Nouvelles tragi-comiques. The "Advis" to d'Ouville's collection adknowledges the precedence of a nouvelle by Scarron of the same title, but claims superiority. Whereas Scarron's style is a comical one pecu-

liar to him, the "Advis" purports to have retained the serious style and pure meaning of the original. As was established in Chapter 3, Boisrobert is almost certainly the author of this "Advis." Boisrobert apparently had no desire to resolve this quarrel, and subsequently published his own adaptation of Tirso's Palabras y Plumas bearing the identical title as Scarron's version of the same source. The abbot's intention must certainly have been to outdo his rival. One can speculate that Boisrobert intended to illustrate the inferiority of Scarron's burlesque version by rendering a faithful translation of the original as his brother had done in the Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires. D'Ouville, however, possessed a facility with the Spanish language which Boisrobert lacked. Although not without merit, the abbot's version possesses neither the quality of translation exhibited by d'Ouville, nor the originality of Scarron's burlesque creation.

The following pages will first view the individual works in detail and afterwards examine their differences and similarities. The major objectives in this chapter will be to differentiate through the actual texts the contrasting literary climates in which they were produced; to determine to what degree the French reproductions are translations; and to ascertain if particular variations were intentional or accidental.

Palabras y Plumas

Tirso's Palabras y Plumas was written in 1614 or 1615, staged in 1623, and published in the first part of his comedias in 1627.[1] The subject, which deals with a generous lover who impoverished himself in the attempt to win the love of a lady, may have been based on a novella

found in Boccaccio's Decameron. As De Armas has indicated, however, the incidents of this novella do not have any relation to Tirso's play.[2] The play, which consists of three acts, is situated in Naples. The major characters are: Matilde, the princess of Salerno; Próspero, the prince of Taranto and Matilde's lover, whose appearance is described in the first scene as bizarre, with many feathers; Don Íñigo, a Spanish soldier in love with Matilde; Sirena, Don Íñigo's sister with whom the king falls in love; and Don Fernando I, the king of Naples.

In the first scene, Próspero voiced a jealous tirade against Matilde and women, whom he accused of being universally deceptive:

> ¡Ingrata!, ¿qué es lo que quieres?
> ¿Para que a voces me llamas?
> Cuando a Don Íñigo amas,
> ¡finges que por mí te mueres!
> . . . . . .
> Si el alma a un español das,
> ¿por qué en mí tu amor ensayas?[3]

He ignored her pleas of innocence, further accusing her of pretending to love him only in order to be the princess of Taranto:

> Ya yo sé que en esta empresa,
> si fingiste amarme tanto,
> fué por verte de Taranto,
> siendo mi esposa, Princesa; (Tirso, p. 1169)

Matilde responded that she had so little interest in his estate, that she wished she could impoverish him in order to prove her love:

> Tan lejos de apetecer
> tu Estado estoy por quererte,
> que quisiera empobrecerte
> para darte nuevo ser. (Tirso, p. 1169)

She swore that although Don Íñigo's love for her was excessive, she had only repaid him with disdain, while the prince had her heart. Harassed by Próspero's persistent denunciations, Matilde pointed out that she owed the Spaniard works and he only words and feathers; hence the title Palabras y Plumas. Were his judge not blind, she added, the Spaniard would certainly be victorious, but she unfortunately adored the prince's feathers more than the Spaniard's deeds:

> Pues debo al español obras,
> a ti, palabras y plumas.
> Mas como tras ti te llevas
> la inclinación que te adora,
> una pluma tuya agora
> estimo en mas que las pruebas,
> gastos e invenciones nuevas
> de ese español, cuyo fuego
> aborrezco, aunque no niego
> que con victoria saliera
> si en su pretensión tuviera
> un juez que no fuera ciego. (Tirso, p. 1170)

She implored him to enter the ring, and as a symbol that he fought for her, she took one of his blue feathers and in return gave him a green scarf.

In Scene II, the action moves to the king's chambers where Rugero was consoled for having lost Salerno to Matilde. As compensation for his loss, the king made Rugero count of Celano. Rugero expressed concern that Matilde, being a relative and friend of the count of Anjou, would give him entrance into Salerno. To the king's response that Matilde had sworn her fidelity, Rugero countered that personal interest preempted fidelity. He accused Matilde of being a traitor, and was consequently granted his requested commission to serach her home. If incriminating evidence was found, Salerno would be his. Rugero vowed

to himself that he would regain this territory by the utilization of a forged letter.

In the following scenes, Don Íñigo lamented his insane love for the ungrateful and tyrannical Matilde. He spoke to his sister of the many services he had performed for Matilde, always adhering to the motto: "Obrar callando y padecer secreto." (Tirso, p. 1174) Having defeated the overly feathered prince in the ring, Matilde blamed the Spaniard for her lover's disgraceful fall. Sirena praised her brother's conduct, and compared his love to that of Matilde's less worthy suitor, who in a cowardly manner based his love on words alone:

> Diverso fué del tuyo su conceto:
> él en palabras todo su amor precia,
> y tú, en obrar callando; que es discreto,
> aunque Matilde tu valor desprecia,
> obrar callando y padecer secreto.
> Su habladora divisa juzgo necia,
> pues de plumas y lenguas hizo alarde,
> porque el parlero amor siempre es cobarde. (Tirso, p. 1175)

The recreant prince appeared at Don Íñigo's home to protest the pretensions of the Spaniard stating that he was offended, not jealous, that knowing who he was, Íñigo had dared to profess his love for Matilde:

> Cuanto a esta parte, no estoy
> celoso, aunque si ofendido
> de que os hayais atrevido
> a amar, sabiendo quién soy,
> aun la sombra de Matilde,
> que mirar no merecéis. (Tirso, p. 1176)

Don Íñigo replied that he respected Próspero's nobility and valor, but that he was his equal in quality if not in quantity (wealth). The quarrel persisted and the two were on the verge of drawing swords, when

Sirena entered, announcing that Matilde was in danger of drowning. Íñigo rushed to her aid, leaving Próspero motionless. When criticized by Sirena for remaining, the prince stated that having fallen in the ring, he feared for his health, and moreover did not know how to swim:

> Mi salud, Sirena, temo;
> que cayendo en la sortija,
> me puede hacer mucho daño
> entrar en el mar tan presto.
> . . . . . .
> ¿qué ayuda le puedo dar
> si nunca supe nadar? (Tirso, p. 1178)

Don Íñigo carried the unconscious princess to his home, and in order not to displease her with his presence, left her in the care of his sister and Gallardo:

> Yo sé que el mayor servicio
> que puedo hacerla, Sirena,
> es irme y no darle pena
> con mi vista. (Tirso, p. 1180)

In Scene XVII, it is learned that Rugero had caused Matilde's accident. Angered by his failure, he prepared his next step with his servant Teodoro. He planned to pretend to have found the forged letter among her possessions. Not content, however, with the limitations of this act, he decided that Matilde must also die, and plotted to set fire to Don Íñigo's home. Próspero secretly entered her bedroom, and immediately proceeded to accuse the innocent Matilde of having surrendered to Don Íñigo. After having futilely served her for three years, he announced that he was going to Rome to cure himself of love. Matilde retorted with a verbose denunciation which elucidates the play's title and theme. Equating works to love and words to the wind, she accused

Próspero of being judicious in the first and fertile in the latter. He had not dared to wet his fancy feathers, for love flies but does not swim:

> Príncipe, obras son amores,
> que las palabras se van,
> como son hijas del viento,
> tras él, sin volver jamás.
> Entre las olas me viste,
> con su salado cristal
> luchando a brazo partido;
> entró en él a poner paz
> el valeroso español;
> y tú, cuerdo en el obrar,
> si loco en el prometer,
> no te atreviste a mojar
> las plumas, como tú vanas;
> pero no anduviste mal,
> que Amor vuela, mas no nada,
> y así, no supo nadar. (Tirso, p. 1182)

Próspero responded that he had had enough of her ridicule, and would imitate her in truly moulting his feathers. The most effective cure against one venim being another, the following day he would take revenge by marrying Rugero's sister, Laura. At these words, Matilde recanted, and asked to make peace. Unwittingly prophesying the future, Próspero wished a series of unfortunate happenings upon Matilde in order that he be able to show his love by deeds. Matilde had ironically employed this same wish for bad luck in an earlier scene in order to prove her love for Próspero:

> Plegue a Dios, Matilde mía,
> que te quite un desleal
> el Estado con la hacienda;
> que te mande desterrar
> el Rey; que en aquesta quinta
> se encienda un fuego voraz,
> para que entonces conozcas
> mi amor firme y liberal. (Tirso, p. 1182)

No sooner had he spoken these words than cries of fire were heard. Entrapped within the bedroom, their only exit was the window. Matilde suggested they cut the prince's cape into pieces and tie them together, but he was too frightened to do more than attempt to leap out the window, counseling Matilde to do the same. To her accusatory inquiry concerning his promises, the pusillanimous prince parroted her previous perception:

> Aquí, Princesa, verás,
> lo que hay del decir a hacer.
> En muerte no hay juramento
> con que obligarme presumas.
> porque palabras y plumas
> dicen que las lleva el viento. (Tirso, p. 1183)

The dastardly prince threatened to stab her, when determined that he would die with her, Matilde attempted to prevent him from jumping. Don Íñigo a second time appeared to her rescue, and Act I terminates with her promise that he would be the prince of Salerno.

Act II opens in the king's chambers. Rugero had presented his forged letter to the king, who offered him Salerno in compensation. He ordered Rugero to notify Matilde that she be out of the kingdom within nine days. To his sister Laura, the king gave Próspero in marriage. Matilde entered, proclaiming her innocence and the guilt of her accuser. The king refused to listen, ordering her out of his kingdom. Upon leaving his chambers, Matilde asked Próspero for aid. He refused, stating that he could not cast doubt upon his good reputation, and asked that she not call or name him, as he was to marry Rugero's sister. In the following scene Matilde solitarily lamented her fate and the prince's disreputable character in a soliloquy:

> Tres elementos, bárbaro, han mostrado
> que eres cobarde, ingrato y avariento;
> en el cuarto tu amor solo has cifrado.
> ¡Qué a mi costa, villano, experimento
> que en palabras y plumas me has pagado!
> Mas quien de ellas fió, que cobre en viento. (Tirso, p. 1188)

In Scene V, Gallardo enumerated the few remaining items left after the fire's destruction. He emphasized the poverty of Don Íñigo, stating that all he lacked as graduate of Lazarillo de Tormes was a cleric or blind man as master. The following day, they came upon the destitute Matilde, who relayed her tale to the equally impoverished master and servant. Don Íñigo nonetheless offered his aid recommending that: "Vamos, señora, a las obras, / y dejemos las palabras." (Tirso, p. 1192) Matilde, who had learned the worthlessness of words, now wanted to learn from Don Íñigo to "obrar callando." (Tirso, p. 1193)

In the meantime, Sirena had taken refuge with Rugero's sister, Laura, who, enamored with Don Íñigo, was less than pleased at the king's choice of Próspero as her husband:

> Ay amiga!, no me nombres
> amante tan palabrero;
> Si así son todos los hombres,
> Sirena, a ninguno quiero. (Tirso, p. 1194)

They were approached by a beggar, whom Sirena recognized as Gallardo. Taken by surprise, Gallardo was unable to produce an appropriate explanation, and remarked to himself that he was no longer who he was accustomed to being: "Ya se me olvida el mentir; / no soy yo quién ser solía." (Tirso, p. 1195) Shortly after Gallardo's departure, the king unexpectedly appeared in Laura's home. Upon meeting Sirena, he was so enraptured by her beauty that he professed his love and honorable

intentions. He promised Laura that if Próspero was an odious union, and if with time, she maintained her faith in the Spaniard, he would consent to their marriage. Upon learning this news, Don Íñigo vowed to Matilde that he would not forsake her, and that now she would know who he was: "Agora veréis quién soy." (Tirso, p. 1202)

Act III opens at night with the king and Próspero at Laura and Sirena's window. Rugero and Teodoro also approached the house, and in the darkness, Rugero confused Teodoro with the king, and consequently revealed by word and by letter the conspiracy against Matilde. The treason discovered, Matilde regained her favor and the principalities of Salerno and Valdeflor. Her fortune restored, Próspero attempted to regain her love, and was informed that the king, being just, would repay their love equally. She then announced to Don Íñigo that she was marrying someone who had served and adored her for many years. The humble Spaniard prejudged his rejection in favor of the arrogant prince who presumed his victory. When the king offered her Próspero's hand in marriage, she asked if it were just that words were repaid with words, and deeds with deeds. To his affirmative reply, she then repaid Próspero with words, and a single feather she had as remembrance of his love, and requested Don Íñigo's hand in marriage:

> Tres años ha que es ejemplo
> de valor y de firmeza,
> siendo su amor todo manos,
> si el Príncipe sólo lenguas.
> Tres veces me dió la vida,
> y es bien, pues es dueño de ella,
> que tome su posesion,
> y, premiando su nobleza,
> en su favor sentenciéis
> a que yo su esposa sea. (Tirso, p. 1215)

The king granted her request, adding that as words in kings had the power of works, he wished to repay his debt by making Sirena his wife and queen:

> Dadle a Matilde la mano;
> y pues hoy se pagan deudas,
> y en los reyes las palabras
> de obras firmes tienen fuerza,
> la que le ha dado mi amor
> a vuestra hermana Sirena
> quiero yo tambien pagar.
> Mi esposa es, y vuestra Reina. (Tirso, p. 1215)

The king granted Próspero Laura's hand in marriage, and ordered festivities to celebrate their respective marriages. The comedia ends with Don Íñigo's recapitulation of its theme:

> Deje palabras quien ama,
> que sin obras todas vuelan;
> porque palabras y plumas
> dicen que el viento las lleva. (Tirso, p. 1215)

The mass weddings thus symbolize the triumph of justice and the kingdom's return to order.

Scarron's "Plus d'effets que de paroles"

Scarron's "Plus d'effets que de paroles," is the fourth nouvelle of the Nouvelles tragi-comiques published in 1656. This publication date is prior to that of Boisrobert's Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses, whose third nouvelle is similarly entitled "Plus d'effets que de paroles."

While acknowledging that the plot, setting, and names of the characters of Scarron's and Boisrobert's nouvelle are the same as those

found in Tirso's comedia, Palabras y Plumas, De Armas proposes the following as possible sources for both the comedia and the nouvelles: Agreda y Vargas' novela, "La resistencia premiada" published in 1620 in his collection of Novelas morales; Lope de Vega's "El halcón de Federico" which was based on an aforementioned novella in Boccaccio's Decameron; Lope's Amar, servir y esperar, a comedia based on Castillo Solórzano's novela, El socorro en el peligro."[4] The examination of the comedia and nouvelles in this chapter conclusively establishes that the source of both French adaptations is, as G. Hainsworth has illustrated, that of Tirso de Molina's Palabras y Plumas: "All the material data used by Boisrobert, and nearly all those used by Scarron, go back to Tirso's Palabras y Plumas."[5] Tirso may have had recourse to any or all of the above texts in writing his comedia, but Palabras y Plumas is unquestionably the primary source for both nouvelles.

Boisrobert's work bears little resemblance to Scarron's burlesque and anti-heroic version, and the abbot unquestionably had the Spanish text at hand when writing his own adaptation. Boisrobert's debt to Scarron might therefore be subtle, but it cannot be completely denied. The abbot had certainly read Scarron's text and obviously adopted his title. Moreover, the form of the nouvelle adopted by Boisrobert is that of Scarron, not of Tirso. As both adaptations incorporate translation and creativity, the degree of the abbot's debt to Scarron cannot be determined with any certainty. One could speculate that he consciously attempted not to utilize the burlesque text, but this decision could not have made him unaware of its presence. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Boisrobert's intention must certainly have been to

outdo Scarron's version. One can therefore only conclude that Boisrobert's adaptation is the product of both sources, with the Spanish comedia being the more obvious model.

Analysis. As in Tirso's play, Scarron situates the action in Naples. The characters in Scarron's version are: Alphonse (Tirso's Fernando I--Scarron expresses uncertainty as to his name), the king of Naples; Matilde de Tarente (Tirso's Matilde de Salerno); Prosper, the prince of Salerne (Próspero of Taranto), Matilde's suitor; Hypolite (Don Íñigo), a poor Spanish nobleman in love with Matilde; Irène (Sirena), Hypolite's sister with whom the king falls in love; Fulvio (Gallardo), Hypolite's lackey; Roger (Rugero), Matilde's cousin; and Camille (Laura), Roger's sister.

The tale begins with an exposition of events not to be found in Tirso's play. Matilde is described as a sweet and gentle young heiress of seventeen years in age: "belle comme un ange, et aussi bonne que belle, mais d'une bonté si extraordinaire. . . ."[6] She had been promised in marriage to the prince of Salerne, a haughty middle-aged man of forty-five years whom she feared and loved by habit rather than inclination. For his part, Prosper was by nature incapable of a great love, or in placing beauty and merit above wealth. Scarron's depiction of the ill-humored prince is a satiric work of art, or as Hainsworth states, "a masterpiece of restrained humour and detailed realism."[7]

> Il était de l'âge que je vous ai déjà dit, propre en sa personne et en ses habits, curieux en perruques, mais assuré qu'il avait peu de cheveux à lui, avait grand soin de ses dents, qui étaient assez belles, quoique par le temps un peu allongées; se piquait de belles mains, et s'était laissé croître l'ongle du petit doigt de la gauche jusqu'à une grandeur étonnante, ce qu'il croyait le plus galant du

> monde. Il était admirable en ses plumes et en ses rubans, ponctuel toutes les nuits à mettre ses bigotères, toujours parfumé, et toujours ayant dans ses poches quelque chose à manger et quelques vers à lire. . . . (Scarron, p. 134)

Prosper's contention for the princess's hand was opposed by one lone rival whom he mortally hated. Described as the perfect "honnête homme," Hypolite was the descendant of a once wealthy Spanish family to whom fortune had shown her inconstancy. (Scarron, p. 136) He lost no opportunity nor spared any sum in demonstrating his love by serenades, tournaments, and fencing bouts. All his efforts left Matilde untouched, and her scorn, which created malicious gossip, only augmented Hypolite's love.

Matilde's cousin, Roger, is depicted by Scarron as ambitious and avaricious. Whereas Tirso's king inexplicably and arbitrarily favors Rugero over Matilde, Scarron elucidates this point by adding that Roger had been reared with the king, was of his age, and was moreover the arbiter of all the king's amusements. He thus had the king's consent and authority in obtaining Tarente, having further persuaded him that Matilde was a traitor in conspiracy with the king's enemies. The subsequent action taken by Matilde's respective suitors as a result of the king's decision, clearly exemplified their worth:

> Prosper, qui lui était obligé plus qu'un autre, fit pour elle encore moins que les autres, au lieu qu'Hypolite fit pour elle tout ce qu'il devait. (Scarron, p. 138)

Hypolite spent an extraordinary sum to regain Tarente for Matilde, whereas Prosper abandoned her. The process decided in Matilde's favor, Hypolite celebrated with a grand tournament in which he won all honors. Prosper attempted to rival him, but, covered with feathers, fell at the

first obstacle. Matilde blamed Hypolite for Prosper's fall, and Prosper blamed Matilde:

> Prosper le lui voulut disputer, couvert de plumes plus qu'aucun homme ne l'avait jamais été, mais il tomba dès sa première course par sa faute, ou par celle de son cheval, et se fit grand mal, ou en fit semblant. On le porta chez Matilde, qui en quitta le balcon de déplaisir, et en maudit cent fois l'amoureux Hypolite . . . Prosper cependant, enragé de sa chute, traitait Matilde d'une terrible manière, jusqu'à lui dire qu'elle était cause de sa disgrâce, et à lui reprocher qu'elle était amoureuse d'Hypolite. (Scarron, p. 141)

The forlorn lover was consoled by his beautiful sister who had recently come to Naples, and who had viewed the tournament incognito. Prosper meanwhile continued to unjustly criticize Matilde's behavior. In a scene occurring outside the king's chambers, Prosper inexplicably attempted to flee Matilde's presence, anticipating a scene which in Tirso occurs after Próspero unhesitatingly accepted accusations that Matilde was a traitor. Scarron adds an amusing twist to Prosper's character not found in the original. The pompous lover claimed to have been testing Matilde's love by not acting in her interest, and professed dissatisfaction with the results. He accused Matilde of finding marriage with a young ruined nobleman who slavishly fulfilled her desires more acceptable than marriage with himself. Matilde vehemently countered the prince's accusations, stating that one of the greatest signs of her love was not to hate him after the things he had just said to her. She nonetheless satisfied the prince's vanity by vowing her love for him. At that moment, the king left his chambers, and Prosper fled, stating that they must not be seen together. The king received her coldly but with ambivalent responses which could easily

have been interpreted to her advantage or disadvantage.

Scarron carries the prince's idiosyncrasies to the point of the grotesque in a scene humorously depicting Prosper's obsession with feathers. As a sign of their reconciliation, Prosper sent Matilde a feathered hat, but not before he had plucked and arranged the feathers in such a manner that none were new:

> Il lui écrivit donc un billet des plus doux et lui envoya une capeline; mais pour dire les choses comme elles sont, il en avait ajusté lui-même les plumes dont il n'y en avait pas une qui fût neuve. Je pense vous avoir déjà dit qu'il était admirable en ses plumes; c'était en cela seul qu'il faisait dépense, et ne laissait pas d'y faire tous les ménages imaginables. Il diversifiait souvent ses plumes, transplantant les brins d'un bouquet à l'autre, et de vieilles qu'elles étaient, il les savait faire paraître neuves avec autant d'art qu'eût pu le faire le plus adroit maître du métier. (Scarron, p. 146)

En route to a party Matilde was giving in Pouzzol, Prosper stopped at Hypolite's home which was on the way. He promptly began to reproach the Spaniard's pretensions. Hypolite initially responded with respect, but the prince's insolence finally provoked him to the point of arms. At this moment, they learned that due to the sea's turbulence, the lives of several ladies were endangered. Not doubting that one of these ladies was Matilde, Hypolite raced to their salvation, leaving Prosper to excuse himself on the grounds that he did not know how to swim and had furthermore injured himself in a fall the previous day. Scarron's version, unlike that of Tirso, makes no reference to the shipwreck's having resulted from other than natural causes. As in the original the rescued Matilde was lodged in Hypolite's home, where that night she was unexpectedly visited by Prosper. He unjustly criticized her for being lodged in Hypolite's bedroom, and she chided his incapa-

city to swim. He threatened to marry Roger's sister, Camille; Matilde became suppliant; and Prosper softened upon seeing her humiliated to the point he wished. As in the Spanish comedia, Prosper wished for Matilde's misfortune in order to have the opportunity to serve her. Having spoken these words, a fire erupted, and Prosper attempted to flee, oblivious to Matilde's entreaties. She indignantly seized Prosper preventing his escape, and he threatened to beat or kill her. Hypolite suddenly appeared and saved not only the princess, but--an addition to the original--her cowardly suitor as well. The Spaniard's home and belongings were destroyed by the fire, which, as in the comedia, had been caused by Matilde's cousin, Roger. While Hypolite's house burned, Roger had searched Matilde's, where he claimed to have discovered a letter proving her conspiracy against the king. The king refused to see her and ordered her to leave Naples; Prosper pretended to be ill; and her friends and servants abandoned her. She secretly departed by night in disguise, leaving Hypolite dismayed at being unable to find her. Prosper meanwhile spoke of her as of a criminal, and as Tirso's version, asked the king for Camille's hand in marriage. Camille was beautiful and generous. She considered Hypolite the perfect soldier, and whereas Tirso's Laura unhesitatingly declared her love for Don Iñigo, Scarron expresses uncertainty as to whether or not Camille loved Hypolite:

> elle considérait Hypolite comme le plus parfait cavalier de son siècle, et peut-être qu'elle l'aimait, ou du moins qu'elle l'eût aimé, si elle ne l'eût point vu si passionnément amoureux d'une autre. (Scarron, p. 154)

Camille went to Hypolite's burned house and found his sister Irène, whom she brought to her own home. That same day, Camille was visited by the

king, who, to her displeasure, presented to her Prosper and all his gallantry. Seeing Irène for the first time, the young king, who had always appeared indifferent to the most beautiful women, fell "violently" in love. Scarron states that Camille too easily believed the king was in love with Irène because she wished it to be so. Irène, on the other hand, believed he had been more gallant than in love, but, Scarron adds, she was mistaken. The king confided to Prosper his intention to go incognito, in Spanish style, to pay court to Irène beneath Camille's balcony. The subsequent dialogue increased the king's esteem for Irène, who cleverly countered his amorous advances with her accustomed modesty and expressions of doubt as to his intentions.

Scarron extends the one visit in the comedia paid by the king to Sirena's window to an habitual action. As in the original, the king discovered Roger's betrayal as the result of this escapade, with Scarron's addition of a duel between the two not found in Tirso. Once Roger's treachery against both Matilde and the king was discovered, Prosper implored the king to approve his former claim to Matilde. The king meanwhile sent out couriers to discover the whereabouts of Matilde and Hypolite, who had himself been unable to find her. Scarron's Quixotic depiction of the respective wanderings of the two lovers is largely without precedent in the comedia, and constitutes what Hainsworth considers "a parody, in matter, arrangement and tone, of contemporary heroic fiction."[8] The extremely long heroic, gallant, or epic novels were popular during a twenty year period from 1640 to 1660, and combined historical and imaginary persons and events. Scarron's satiric parody creates and comprises the genre of the bur-

lesque, defined by a contemporary, Naudé, and reproduced in Adam's Histoire as follows:

> Le style de Marot et de Scarron, c'est "l'explication des choses les plus sérieuses par des expressions tout à fait plaisantes et ridicules (c'est-à-dire, au sens latin, qui font rire)."[9]

The episode involving Hypolite's quest in search of Matilde in Scarron's "Plus d'effets" portrays the desolate lover, much to the discontent of his valet, spending entire days sighing on his unguided horse and entire nights lamenting Matilde's absence to the rocks, trees, and "innocent" stars. Finding themselves in front of a tavern, Fulvio, without mentioning his own hunger and fatigue, warned his master of the hunger and fatigue of their horses. They were lodged under questionable circumstances, and in the middle of the night, the sleepless lover heard doors opening, and people entering and leaving. In the adjacent room, he heard the voices of two women, one of whom he believed to be Matilde. At that moment four men suddenly entered with swords. Hypolite and his valet killed two of the men in the fight which ensued, and pursued the others, who fled. Upon returning to the tavern, the room from which Hypolite had heard voices, was deserted. The disheartened lover was so inconsolable that he heard nothing of what his valet asked or demanded, and they thus departed with the thieves' horses. They rode aimlessly until stopped by an armed mob of angry peasants who told them that they and their neighbors had been robbed and pillaged by Moorish soldiers. With Hypolite's aid, the Moors were defeated, and none other than Matilde discovered among the captives. Having related the tale of her captivity, Matilde

expressed her eternal gratitude for Hypolite's services, but nonetheless refused to allow him to conduct her to her destination. Hypolite returned penniless to his burned home, where he learned of Roger's disgrace and the affirmation of Matilde's innocence, but also of the king's promise to Prosper of Matilde's hand in marriage. He was so discouraged at this news, that he did not return to court, and subsequently knew nothing of his sister's reign on the monarch's will. Hypolite's valet informed his master that Prosper had been sent by the king to bring Matilde back to Naples. Fulvio exaggerated Matilde's joy upon seeing Prosper and her passion for him to such a degree that Hypolite ordered him to be quiet, and Scarron adds that: "peut-être qu'il l'eût battu, s'il eût continué à n'en parler pas avec tout le respect qu'il lui devait. (Scarron, p. 178) Fulvio further informed Hypolite that Matilde wished to see him. In the presence of Prosper, Matilde invited the disconsolate Spaniard to her wedding to take part in her good fortune:

> Elle le conjura de venir prendre part en sa bonne fortune, comme il l'avait toujours prise dans toutes ses adversités; et ajouta qu'ayant fait dessein de se marier, parce qu'elle avait connu par de fâcheuses expériences qu'une jeune princesse sans parents avait besoin d'un mari puissant qui la protégeât, et qu'ayant déjà jeté les yeux sur celui qu'elle voulait faire prince de Tarente, elle souhaitait qu'il lui fît l'honneur d'assister à ses noces. (Scarron, p. 179)

The unhappy Hypolite interpreted Matilde's words as new cruelties she wished to inflict upon him, whereas Prosper viewed them as an assurance of his success. The nervous prince talked incessantly, and succeeded in being listened to whether one wanted or not. Upon the king's arrival, he needlessly introduced Matilde, and parroted her words of

gratitude for the king's favor. As concerns the "dénouement" of the tale, Hainsworth states: "In these last pages, Scarron's incidental reflections suffice to depoetize the whole conception of the scene and make of it a 'dénouement' which parodies 'dénouements.'"[10] Included among Scarron's incidental depoetizing remarks is a paragraph on the heat of the sun: "qui donnait bien fort sur cette noble assistance, y chauffait bien des têtes, et surtout celles qui étaient chauves," (Scarron, pp. 181-182) and the flies, which: "incommodaient beaucoup les visages, tourmentaient cruellement les chevaux," and in particular "ceux qui avaient le moins de queue." (Scarron, p. 182) Scarron adds that the king was not disturbed by the heat or insects as: "le roi ne s'ennuyait jamais où était Irène." (Scarron, p. 182)

The king offered Prosper's hand in marriage to Matilde as compensation for his services. The princess replied that by giving her this grand prince, the king would be giving Prosper less than he merited and her more:

> Vous ne donneriez pas à Prosper tout ce qu'il mérite, en ne lui donnant que Matilde, et en me donnant ce grand prince de Salerne, vous me donneriez plus que je n'ai mérité. (Scarron, p. 183)

She asked Hypolite to approach, and expressed the extent of the services she owed him, but adding that those owed to Prosper, being older and more urgent, should come first. At these words, Hypolite became pale, and Prosper knowingly regarded him with a sardonic grin. Matilde then turned to the prince. She told him that having convinced her that he had loved her since her childhood, he had also always treated her as a child, and the greatest mark he had ever given her of his love was a

bouquet of old feathers. Thereupon she removed the feathered hat from her head and returned it to Prosper, announcing that she gave herself to Hypolite, in whom she had found more actions than words:

> Dans le temps, poursuivit-elle, que je m'acquitte avec vous, en vous rendant des paroles et des plumes pour celles que vous m'avez données, je me donne à Hypolite et le fais prince de Tarente pour m'acquitter avec le plus généreux de tous les hommes, en qui j'ai trouvé PLUS D'EFFETS QUE DE PAROLES. (Scarron, p. 184)

The king presented Camille to Prosper as compensation for his loss, and announced his own intention to marry Irène. The three marriages were thus celebrated with festivities. Scarron goes beyond the Spanish text, which terminates with the mass weddings and Don Íñigo's recapitulation of the theme, by summarizing briefly the success of the respective marriages. The king never repented his marriage to Irène, and Matilde and Hypolite remained happily in love. But Camille, who had sacrificed her happiness in order to save her brother's life was unhappily married to the egotistical Prosper:

> La seule Camille fut malheureuse avec Prosper; elle n'osa le refuser de peur de déplaire au roi, qui avait promis à Irène de ne punir Roger que d'un simple bannissement; et ainsi, pour sauver la vie à son frère, elle rendit la sienne malheureuse, épousant un prince avare, impertinent et jaloux, qui fut toute sa vie la risée et le mépris de la Cour de Naples. (Scarron, p. 186)

Scarron thus ends his tale with his customary realism. Although materially based on Tirso's comedia, Scarron's nouvelle bears little resemblance to its model, or more precisely, is a burlesque caricature of this and other heroic, romanesque literature of the age. Don Íñigo's lamentations in the comedia approached the tragic, and what humor

existed was provided by the gracioso, Gallardo. Scarron's melodramatic portrayal of Hypolite exaggerates the protagonist's sorrow to the point of ridicule. Indeed, Hypolite is far less the major character in Scarron's tale than is Prosper. Tirso's Próspero is bizarre and cowardly. Scarron's Prosper is in addition, arrogant, ill-humored, and miserly, besides being almost twenty years Matilde's senior. Tirso's repetitive "palabras y plumas" recurs throughout the comedia. Scarron capitalizes on the portion of this association concerning feathers by creating a character totally obsessed with their collection, plucking, and rearranging. As concerns the "palabras," or Tirso's moral that actions speak louder than words, Scarron's translation of "plus d'effets que de paroles" occurs only once, at the very end of the tale. Scarron thus utilizes the information provided by the comedia in order to create his own anti-heroic and burlesque version of the heroic and romanesque Spanish model.

"Plus d'effets que de paroles"; Boisrobert's version

Boisrobert's "Plus d'effets que de paroles," is a prose rendition of Tirso's comedia, Palabras y Plumas. The historical cadre is Italy in the late fifteenth century. The major characters are: Alfonse, the legitimate heir to the throne of Naples; Cesar, one of the king's soldiers; Syrene, Cesar's sister with whom Alfonse is in love; Matilde, the beautiful princess with whom Cesar is in love (inconsistently spelled Maltilde and Matilde); and Prince Federic of Tarente, Cesar's rival. Boisrobert omits the role of the gracioso, Gallardo.

The tale opens with an exposition of the action. Upon returning

from Aragon to Italy, Alfonse fell in love with Syrene, lady in waiting to his sister. Syrene's brother, Cesar, was the youngest member of the Avalos family of Spain, and had advanced considerably because of his service to Alfonse. As a result, he aspired to attain the hand of none other than the beautiful Princess, Matilde. Although the prince of Tarente, a wealthy and powerful noble of illustrious birth appeared to be the favored, Cesar deemed himself a worthy rival in consideration of his equally noble birth, his handsome appearance, and gallant actions. Moreover, he had succeeded in bribing the court in Matilde's favor when her succession to the principality of Salerne was contested by her cousin Dom Roger, and was reproved by his sister for his excessive expenditures on tournaments and public celebrations in Matilde's honor. Syrene realistically assessed the conditions, and unlike her Spanish counterpart, who defended her brother's conduct and aspirations, she counseled Cesar to consider the inequality of their positions:

> Considerez, mon cher frere, l'inégalité qu'il y a de vostre condition à la sienne, & guerissez vous par la raison, ne voyez-vous pas qu'elle est adorée d'vn Prince riche & puissant, qui depuis qu'il la void en possession d'vn si grand Estat redouble ses soins & ses deuoirs pour elle qui augmentent pour vous ses indiferences, & ses mépris?

Cesar agreed with his sister's evaluation, but added that he must concede to his destiny which impelled him to love Matilde, even though she disdained his services:

> mais ie sens auec tout cela qu'il faut que ie cede à la force de mon destin qui me contraint d'adorer Maltilde, toute fiere & toute méconnoissante qu'elle est. (Boisrobert, p. 317)

All Naples knew of Cesar's love for Matilde. As his love for her was greater than that of her other suitors, unlike Don Íñigo who valued discretion in adhering to the maxim: "Obrar callando y padecer secreto" (Tirso, p. 1174), Cesar contended that he wished to illustrate his love more splendidly. Although not well enough established to overshadow Dom Federic, his reputation and appearance had not left the prince without concern. Upon further learning of Matilde's confessed obligation towards the gallant Spaniard, Federic exploded with jealousy and accusing her of having suffered him because of his fortune, threatened to leave. Matilde consoled him by stating that he should be flattered to possess her favors and her esteem when the poor Spaniard received only insults and disdain. As illustration of the contempt she had exhibited towards Cesar, she reminded Federic of the times she had mistreated him in the prince's presence, to the extent that those in the palace had accused her of incivility. At the present moment, Cesar was planning a magnificent tournament. Explaining that she was committed to place the ring in the victor's hand, she urged Federic to enter and win the prize. To further encourage him to victory, she presented him with a green scarf to wear in her love:

> Allez promptement braue Federic, vous mettre en estat d'-assister à ce tournoy & taschez de gagner ce prix que vous receurez de ma main, comme par auance pour vous animer à la victoire, ie vous donne cette Escharpe verte; portez-la pour l'amour de moy. . . . (Boisrobert, p. 328)

Meanwhile the king entered incognito on the side of his favorite, Dom Cesar. While preparations were being made, the king visited Dom Roger, and to recompense his loss in the case which had been decided in Matilde's favor, Alfonce offered him the Comté de Val de Fleur.

Dom Roger assured the king that his concern at having lost the principality of Salerne was not for himself but for the king. Matilde was a good friend of the king of France who wished to possess the kingdom of Naples, and Dom Roger confessed that he feared she would grant Charles VII a favorable entrance. To the king's response that both Matilde and the prince de Tarente had pledged their fidelity, Roger replied that private interests were above pledges:

> Il est vray, Sire, luy respondit Roger, mais les interests particuliers sont au dessus des sermens, & ie suis tres certain de la correspondance qu'à [sic] Maltilde auec le Prince François vostre ennemy iusques à luy mettre s'il est en son pouuoir vostre Couronne sur la teste. (Boisrobert, pp. 336-337)

Roger counseled the king to have Matilde's home searched for incriminating evidence. Alfonce instructed Roger to search her home himself, and if proof of betrayal was discovered, Salerne would be returned to his possession. Roger accepted the king's commission and secretly vowed to create the evidence if sufficient proof was lacking:

> Roger qui auoit plus parlé par colere que par raison & par connoissance qu'il eust d'vne trahison si noire, se resolut de prendre cette commission à tous hazards, & d'employer l'artifice où il manqueroit de preuues suffisantes pour convaincre son ennemie. (Boisrobert, p. 339)

The author leaves Roger to meditate on his vengeance, and moves the action forward to the tournament. Cesar was victorious, consequently receiving the ring from Matilde's hands. Beside himself with joy upon touching her for the first time, he audaciously declared his desire to leave the ring with her as a sign of his love and of the alliance he would seek with her were he the most powerful monarch in

the world. Recognizing that Federic had overheard this compliment, Matilde cruely retorted in a loud voice that Dom Cesar was of no condition ever to aspire to her alliance:

> Dom Cesar, luy dit-elle, vous ne vous connoissez plus, vous vous estes tellement ennyuré de la vanité de vos belles courses, que vous ne connoissez pas mesme celle à qui vous parlez, car vous verriez bien que vous n'estes pas de condition à pouuoir iamais aspirer à son alliance. (Boisrobert, p. 346)

She then disdainfully turned her back on Dom Cesar, and extended her hand to Dom Federic. The king's aversion for Matilde increased upon witnessing Matilde's unjustified contempt for Dom Cesar, and observing Syrene's reaction to the insult her brother had received. The king lead Cesar and Syrene aside and questioned Matilde's incivility. Syrene was in agreement, but her brother criticized his own conduct and, unlike his Spanish counterpart, who lamented the heroine's cruel tyranny, Cesar defended Matilde's disdain as justified:

> Ah! ma soeur luy respondit le genereux D. Cesar, ie sçay que ie ne puis rien esperer, mais ie ne puis me defaire de ma passion, la belle Maltilde a payé ma temerité d'vn iuste mespris, on ne peut auec justice l'accuser d'inciuilité pour ce qu'elle a fait, mais on me doit blasmer d'imprudence d'auoir osé faire vne declaration si hardie dans vn lieu si public & où elle voyoit tant d'yeux attachez sur elle. (Boisrobert, p. 349)

The king forbade Cesar's defense of the ungrateful Matilde, confiding that he had knowledge that she was betraying him. Cesar assured Alfonce that his passion for Matilde did not alter his loyalty to the king, but refused to believe that she had the slightest intention of betraying him. He requested Syrene's aid in discovering Matilde's accusers. Matilde had meanwhile repented her cruelty towards Cesar the

day of the tournament. She sought to justify her behaviour to Syrene, explaining that she had mistreated Cesar only in order to appease Federic's jealousy. Upon hearing this explanation, Cesar, more in love than ever, visited Matilde, and left satisfied by their conversation. The prince of Tarente learned through his spies of this reconciliation. More jealous than ever, he went to Cesar's home and criticized the audacity of the Spaniard's pretentions. Having patiently listened to the prince's affront, Cesar providently replied that pride and arrogance were the signs of an innate cowardness:

> Ah! Prince luy dit D. Cesar, ces discours iniurieux lassent, enfin mon respect & ma patience, & si vous n'estiez chez moy ie vous ferois souuenir plus par les effets que par les paroles, que la vraye valeur est tousiours accompagnée de ciuilité & que l'orgueil & l'arrogance sont des marques d'vne lascheté naturelle. (Boisrobert, pp. 362-363)

Syrene, who had been gazing at the sea, suddenly entered, announcing that Matilde's boat had been hit by another and was sinking. Cesar sped straight into the sea and rescued Matilde as Federic numbly watched. When criticized by Syrene for his immobile suspension, the prince abruptly left after having excused himself on the grounds that he could not swim well and that he had hurt himself in a fall during the tournament:

> Madame, luy respondit Federic, i'abandonnerois ma vie de bon coeur, si en l'abandonnant ie pouuois sauuer Maltilde, mais outre que ie ne sçay pas nager assez bien pour la secourir en vn besoin si pressant, vous vous souuiendrez s'il vous plaist que vous m'auez veu tomber à la derniere course que i'ay faite & le mal que ie ressens encore de cette cheute ne me permet pas de me mettre à l'eau. (Boisrobert, pp. 365-366)

Having done all that was necessary to save her, Cesar left the still

unconscious Matilde in the care of his sister, and departed for fear of offending her:

> n'ayant pû vaincre iusques icy la cruelle auersion qu'elle a tesmoigné auoir contre moy, ie n'ose presumer que par ce dernier que ie luy viens de rendre, i'aye adouci sa rigueur inuincible, ie m'oste donc de deuant ses yeux de crainte de l'offenser & la laisse dans vne Maison dont elle est Maistresse absoluë. (Boisrobert, pp. 368-369)

Meanwhile, D. Roger, who had caused the shipwreck, plotted still another means to destroy Matilde with his evil confidant, Tebalde. Unlike Tirso's version where the prince is himself responsible for both origin and execution of the deed, Boisrobert's character merely submits to the plots of his evil counselor. Tebalde had obtained a forged letter with Charles VIII's signature. He suggested that they present it to the king as evidence of Matilde's betrayal, declaring it to have been discovered among her possessions. He further recommended that they burn Cesar's house, thereby simultaneously killing both Matilde and the annoying Spaniard who persisted in saving her.

Federic in the meantime secretly entered Matilde's room in Cesar's home, unjustifiably accusing her of being the Spaniard's mistress. Matilde did not passively accept his accusations, retorting that love consisted of actions, not words, and that he had no grounds to criticize her. She observed pointedly that he had not had the courage to enter the water to save her for fear of wetting his feathers. This passage follows Tirso's in theme and sequence of events, but lacks the play on words which form the essence of the original:

> Sçachez Prince, que l'Amour consiste aux effets & non point aux paroles, comme elles sont filles du vent, il les emporte quand & [sic] luy, & ne reuiennent iamais, vous m'auez veuë

> au milieu de la Mer, combattant contre la mort, & vous n'auez pas eu le courage de vous mettre à l'eau de crainte de moüiller vos plumes. (Boisrobert, pp. 378-379)

She further emphasized that the Spaniard had shown proof of his love by his actions. Frederic coldly responded that as she was inconstant and rejected him for a lowly stranger, he would marry her cousin, Dom Roger's sister. Not yet ready to cede his loss, Matilde quickly apologized to the prince, swearing she loved him and not Dom Cesar. Satisfied by her concession, Federic kissed her hand, prophetically declaring that in order not to suffer the shame of being surpassed by the Spaniard, he would dare to wish her dispossessed in order to prove his love by his actions:

> i'ose coniurer le Ciel, ma belle & chere Princesse, qu'vn traistre s'empare de vos Estats & de vos richesses, que vous puissiez deuenir pauure, & que quelque accident menace vostre vie, afin que ie vous fasse connoistre par des effets, que mépriſant tout peril pour l'amour de vous, le bien, l'honneur, la faueur du Roy & la vie mesme ne me sont rien à l'égal de vous. (Boisrobert, p. 384)

In Tirso's version, this harangue was delivered twice: first in a much less embellished form by Matilde, whom Próspero had accused of loving him for his wealth, and a second time, by Próspero, in the prophetic form adopted here by Boisrobert. Federic's speech anticipates all that will befall Matilde, and his complete inability to act on his words. The prince had barely uttered this wish, when the first opportunity to prove his courage arose. A fire had erupted and blocked the entrance to Matilde's upstairs bedroom. The only exit was through the window, and her cowardly lover suggested she jump after him. Matilde suggested he rip his cape into strips in order to escape. The French text follows

the original in the above phrase, but apparently dissatisfied with the irrationality of this means of escape, Boisrobert has his character object that had they the time to cut them, the sheets would be much more practical. The dastardly prince was, however, too frightened for his own life to waste time saving Matilde's, and he quickly bounded out the window. Boisrobert omits the melodramatic scene of the Spanish text in which Próspero threatened to stab Matilde for blocking his exit. Here, as in the original, Matilde was once again saved by the noble Spaniard, who risking his own life appeared to rescue her. Once out of danger, Matilde, recognizant of his love, all but threw herself at his feet, and she gave her word that he would be the prince of Salerne:

> Ouy, ouy braue Espagnol, vostre generosité m'a dessilé les yeux, qu'vne folle Passion auoit aueuglez, & ie vous donne ma foy, que dans demain vous serez Prince de Salerne. (Boisrobert, p. 392)

At these words, the elated Spaniard threw himself at her feet, protesting that he had only done what his honor required him to do and vowing to be her most obedient servant.

In the meantime, having learned of his second failure, Dom Roger presented to the king the forged letter incriminating Matilde. The unsuspecting king embraced Roger, and assured him that the principality of Salerne was now his. He warned that if Matilde were not out of his kingdom within one week, he would be without mercy. Upon hearing of the king's pronouncement against Matilde, Frederic went to his chambers to ask the reason. Informed of the king's evidence, Frederic did not hesitate to renounce his former fiancée. He quickly departed

upon being informed that Matilde had arrived with Syrene to plead her innocence. Roger remained, and as soon as Matilde had read the forged letter, she looked at him and demanded if he were both the accuser and the forger. The king refused to believe Matilde's innocence, but pledged that were she not guilty, remuneration would be made. Meanwhile she was ordered to seek refuge outside the kingdom. Upon leaving, Matilde saw Frederic, and informed him that he now had the opportunity to fulfill his wish to defend her. The dastardly prince refused, pleading that he could not risk his own position with the king by defending her. Matilde's wrath was without limit at this last illustration of Federic's detestable cowardice, and she furiously denounced his base behaviour. Dom Cesar had in the meanwhile found money for her, and had rented a boat to take her to an ally. Although Boisrobert alludes to the fact that the couple was in need of money, he in no way reproduces the extreme poverty scenes found in Tirso's version. Upon comparing the deeds of her two suitors, Matilde no longer had difficulty in deciding the worthier of her suitors:

> Matilde confuse de voir vne consistance & vne generosité si grande dans le coeur d'vn homme qu'elle auoit si mal traitté, & vne ingratitude si noire dans l'ame d'vn autre à qui elle auoit fait des graces, n'eut pas grand peine à se resoudre dans l'extremité de son malheur. (Boisrobert, p. 420)

During their absence, a succession of events culminating with Syrene's discovery of a French spy leaving Dom Roger's quarters, established Matilde's innocence. Roger was confined for the remainder of his life in the tower of Chasteau, and his servant Tebalde was executed. The king and Syrene, and Matilde and Cesar were married:

> & ainsi Matilde pour auoir fait plus de cas des effets que des paroles, croyant ne s'estre attachée qu'à l'affection d'vn pauure cadet Estranger, se trouua belle soeur de son Roy, & femme de son Fauory qui par sa vertu se fit General d'Armée & s'éleua par son courage aux plus hautes dignitez où peut paruenir vn Gentilhomme. (Boisrobert, p. 438)

Boisrobert's tale thus terminates with the illustration of its main thesis--that actions have more value than words--and the hero's reward for having faithfully adhered to this principle. Matilde had initially erred in placing more value in Frederic's words than in Cesar's action Her development consisted in a gradual evolution from ignorance to enlightenment. At the outset, she was unaware of the respective worth of her two suitors. She first recognized that the criterion to be applied in evaluating their love was that of actions, not words, but at this stage was emotionally drawn towards the prince. She next perceived that the Spaniard consistently and in the face of all obstacles demonstrated his love by actions, whereas the prince resorted to mere words. Her choice was a rational decision based on her esteem for the Spaniard's merit, and the final product of this esteem was her enlightenment and corresponding love.

Conclusion. The Spanish text belongs to the genre of the comedia, which has been called a collective enterprise symbolizing the communal feeling of the Spanish people as opposed to that of the individual dramatist.[12] As a member of this fixed community, each person was assigned specific responsibilities, hence the importance of the recurring phrase, "soy quién soy." In Palabras y Plumas, all the major characters with the exception of the king employ this expression at least once.

Próspero utilizes it to legitimize his claim on Matilde, and his offense that Don Íñigo had dared to enter his territory, "sabiendo quién soy." (Tirso, p. 1177) Próspero is offended that those who know him as her lover will view Don Íñigo in similar terms: "Bastante / es que os tengan por amante / todos de quién yo lo soy." (Tirso, p. 1177) Próspero's above preoccupation elicits the "valeroso" Spaniard's contention that he knows how to be a man: "Paso, que sé ser hombre. . . ." (Tirso, p. 1177) When the destitute Matilde learns that the king has chosen Laura as Don Íñigo's wife, and consequently professes her understanding if he chooses to accept, Don Íñigo replies that now she will see who he is: "Agora veréis quién soy." (Tirso, p. 1203) Matilde also has recourse to this expression. When dispossessed of her territory and title, she attests to the fact that she no longer is who she is: "Ya que no como quién soy." (Tirso, p. 1187) Even the gracioso, Gallardo, is aware of his role--namely that of a a liar. When unable to fulfill this function, Gallardo subsequently laments that he is not who he is supposed to be: "Ya se me olvida el mentir; / no soy yo quién ser solía." (Tirso, p. 1195)

The king, though failing to vocalize this proclamation, totally fulfills his designated duties. Reichenberger contends that: "A Spanish play follows the pattern from order disturbed to order restored."[13] Order had been disturbed by two parallel events: a rivalry between two suitors for Matilde's hand, and a contestation of territorial rights between Matilde and her cousin. The king's function is to restore order in the kingdom, and the means employed is that of the mass wedding celebrations in which he includes himself. The marriage of Matilde and Don Íñigo, and that of the king and Sirena are choices

desired by all concerned parties. The king's designation of Próspero as Laura's husband is not a desirable choice from her viewpoint, and is explicable only within the context of the comedia. Order has to be restored, and an essential element in its restoration is, as Reichenberger contends, the passage from a non-marital to a marital state: "It is often of no importance that a dama gets her man, the one she loves, as long as she gets a man and is thereby placed in the socially accepted estado of married woman."[14] Viewed from this perspective, Laura's marriage, as do the others, thus fulfills the essential criterion to restore order in the kingdom.

Although reproducing the basic structure and sequence of events of the Spanish comedia, Boisrobert's version manifests no sense of the restoration of the social order present in the original. The corresponding character of Laura is never actively presented, and the cowardly Frederic receives no bride in the end. The double marriages represent the culmination of events leading to the reward of the just and the punishment of the evil. The king is, as of the nouvelle's first page in love with Syrene, and is perhaps the character who has the least in common with his Spanish predecessor. Boisrobert's king is simultaneously in love with Syrene, and is a personal friend of her brother, Cesar, whom he holds in high esteem. He is therefore justified in judging Matilde's treatment of the Spaniard as contemptible, and his failure to perceive her innocence is the result of a comprehensible sequence of events. Tirso's king is a totally different character. He is first and foremost the omniscient dispenser of justice, and afterwards stubborn, credulous, and spontaneous. No rationale exists to explain his credulity in believing Rugero or his refusal to listen to

Matilde's plea of innocence, and his discovery of Rugero's treachery occurs purely by chance. He spontaneously falls in love with Sirena at first glance, and proceeds to present himself at her window the following night. This extraordinary act of chance thereby presents the king with the opportunity to be mistaken for Rugero's servant and thus learn of his betrayal. Throughout the tale he whimsically bestows and revokes marriages according to his subjects' momentary favor or disfavor. Although the play terminates with the restoration of order, one is left with the impression that were the mass weddings to be postponed for any length of time, the partners would surely not be the same. The many puns present in Tirso's work are lost in its adaptation. Boisrobert's comprehension of Spanish was certainly good enough to have recognized these plays on words, but he lacked either the capacity or the interest to faithfully render them into French. He thus makes no attempt to reproduce a pun such as that found in Act I, scene XIV on the word nada:

> que Amor vuela, mas no nada,
> y asi, no supo nadar.
> Nadó don Iñigo en fin;
> su dicha supo pescar;
> y a quien nada y me da vida
> nada es venirle a adorar. (Tirso, p. 1182)

Boisrobert's version offers no hint of the rich verbal imagery of Tirso, nor does he maintain the peculiarly Spanish atmosphere which pervades the original. He omits those characters and events which do not conform to French standards, and adapts only the basic plot into French. He thereby produces a work which is neither a translation nor an original creation, but which is an interesting and cleverly related tale with a unique value in its own right.

Scarron clearly possessed the capacity to have rendered a perfect translation of the comedia, but had neither the patience nor the inclination to do so. He utilized the information provided by Tirso, but exaggerated the romanesque and heroic elements of the Spanish play to the point of the grotesque. He thereby produced a far more original creation than is Boisrobert's nouvelle, and a work which appropriately belongs to the genre he also created and popularized, that of the burlesque.

Notes

[1] Blanca de los Ríos, ed., Obras Dramáticas Completas, by Tirso de Molina (Madrid: Aguilar, 1946), p. 1157.

[2] Frederick A. de Armas, Scarron (New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1972), p. 114.

[3] Tirso de Molina. Palabras y Plumas, ed. Blanca de los Ríos (Madrid: Aguilar, 1946), p. 1168.

[4] De Armas, p. 114.

[5] G. Hainsworth, "New Details on the 'Nouvelles' of Scarron," Bulletin Hispanique, (1947), p. 147.

[6] Paul Scarron, "Plus d'effets que de paroles," in Les Nouvelles tragicomiques, ed. Jean Cassou (Paris: Stock, Delamain et Boutelleau, 1948), p. 133.

[7] Hainsworth, p. 147.

[8] Hainsworth, p. 165.

[9] Antoine Adam, Histoire de la littérature française au XVII^{e} siècle (Paris: Domat, 1947-1956), II, 79.

[10] Hainsworth, p. 167.

[11] François le Métel, Abbé de Boisrobert. "Plus d'effets que de paroles," Les Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses (Paris: P. Lamy, 1657), p. 315.

[12] Arnold G. Reichenberger, "Uniqueness of the 'Comedia,'" Hispanic Review, XXVII (1959), pp. 304-305.

[13] Reichenberger, p. 307.

[14] Reichenberger, p. 310.

Chapter 7

THE LAST NOUVELLE: "LA VIE N'EST QU'UN SONGE"

"La Vie n'est qu'un songe" is the fourth tale of Boisrobert's Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses. The nouvelle, as many critics have observed, is based on La Vida es sueño, a comedia by Calderón de la Barca originally published in 1635. Albert Sloman's comparison of La Vida es sueño with an earlier play Calderón wrote in collobo-ration with Antonio Coello, Yerros de naturaleza y aciertos de la fortuna (1634), establishes the unequivocal character and thematic debt of the comedia to this source.[1] Both plays are set in Poland; both involve characters named Segismundo and Rosaura;[2] and five charac-ters of La Vida es sueño are direct derivations from Yerros.[3] Sloman indicates that the awakened-sleeper situation is clearly anticipated in Yerros, but the important horoscope motif is lacking.[4]

The horoscope motif has been traced by Peter Dunn to Castillo Solórzano's Noches de placer which was first printed in 1631.[5] The premise of the seventh novela, "El pronóstico cumplido," is the ac-complishment of an astrological prediction despite efforts to thwart it. Castillo's tale was adapted from one of the Cento Novelle (1566) of Francesco Sansovino which was in turn copied from I compassionevoli avvenimenti di Erasto (1558), a variant of the group of stories known as the Seven Wise Masters of Rome.[6] Apart from this collection, Dunn

points out that stories of horoscopes and attempts to prevent them and of the supremacy of a son over a father were a part of European folk tradition.[7] Other more contemporary sources of the horoscope motif indicated by Dunn include two plays by Lope: Barlaán y Josafat and Lo que ha de ser, and a novel by Suárez de Mendoza, Eustorgio y Clorilene.[8] G. Hainsworth acknowledges that other prose versions of the life is a dream thesis exist but are posterior to Boisrobert's nouvelle:

> Ce dernier récit ["La Vie n'est qu'un songe"] rappelle de tous points une pièce célèbre de Calderón, et quoiqu'il existe d'autres versions en prose de ce thème intéressant, elles doivent être postérieures à celle de Boisrobert.[9]

Boisrobert's nouvelle was in turn imitated by La Roche-Guilhem, as A. Cioranescu indicates: "El celebre abate Boisrobert lo transformó en novela . . . y la señorita de La Roche-Guilhem deshizo y volvió a rehacer la narración de Boisrobert."[10]

Boisrobert's adaptation of La Vida es sueño follows the action of his source more closely than do any of the other nouvelles with the possible exception of the third tale, "Plus d'effets que de paroles." This is not to contend, however, that the work is a translation. Boisrobert's greater preoccupation was with classical form than philosophical content, and the nouvelle consequently deletes the majority of Calderón's baroque descriptions and metaphysical symbols. Cioranescu's contention that Calderón's imitators were more attracted to the novelistic character of his comedias and to the adventure they related rather than to his metaphysical evasion is certainly applicable to Boisrobert:

> Es característico notar que los traductores apreciaron en la comedia de Calderón, antes que todo, su carácter novelesco y la aventura que relataba, sin tener en cuenta su dramatismo, y todavía menos las escapatorias metafísicas a que nos dejamos deslizar preferentemente, y que posiblemente rebasan las intenciones del propi, sin tener en escapatorias m temente, y que propio autor.[11]

The abbot's resulting adaptation is superior nouvelles in this volume. Three hypotheses can be conjectured to explain this superiority. First, certain orthographic tendencies as the more frequent use of je instead of ie and of un instead of vn indicate that this text is later than the other nouvelles. Secondly, the author made no attempt to disguise his source as he had done in "L'Heureux Desespoir" and the basic plot and action of the original are maintained. Finally, as his original source is a masterpiece and as his alterations adhere to the basic precepts of French classicism, the end result is a logical and rational tale with a touch of sardonic humor to moderate romanesque hyperbolism.

This chapter will consist of a summary of the comedia followed by a comparative analysis of the two texts. The purpose of this comparison is to once again illustrate the tremendous literary and philosophical diversification which existed between the Spanish and French cultures in the seventeenth century.

La Vida es sueño

Scene I of La Vida es sueño opens in darkness with Rosaura, dressed in male clothing, accompanied by her servant, Clarín. Rosaura was lamenting her aimless wandering, led only by the laws of destiny when they suddenly saw a building. The door was open, and they heard chains

from within. Upon further observation, they saw a faint light and discovered a lone figure dressed in hides and carrying a chain. They listened in silence as Segismundo, unaware of their presence, lamented his horrible existence. He theorized that man's greatest sin was to have been born, and deplored the fact that birds, beasts, fish, and inanimate objects were freer than he. His reaction when he realized that he had been overheard was to threaten death: "Pues muerte aquí te daré, / por que no sepas que sé (Ásela.)."[12] Upon seeing Rosaura, however, he demurred. He professed to be a man among beasts and beast among men, confessing that in his life he had seen and spoken to only one man from whom he had learned of the earth and the skies. Rosaura responded that the only comfort she could give him was the knowledge that there was always someone more unfortunate than oneself. Their presence was suddenly discovered by Segismundo's keeper, Clotaldo who instructed masked soldiers to capture or kill them. Rosaura and Clarín were informed by Clotaldo that the king had prohibited entrance to this tower. Rosaura was carrying a golden sword which had been given to her by a woman. This person had instructed her to go to Poland where she would be favored by one in power who would recognize this sword. At these words, Clotaldo realized that Rosaura, whom he believed to be male, was his own child. He debated his course of action, for the king had decreed that anyone who saw Segismundo had to die. His decision was that loyalty to the king transcended life and honor, and therefore chose to present Rosaura to the king.

The scene which follows occurs at court and portrays Astolfo and Estrella, the two pretenders to the throne. Unaware of Segismundo's existence, Astolfo attempted to prove his own priority to the throne

while simultaneously wooing his unresponsive cousin who expressed suspicion of the portrait he wore around his neck. Both pretenders' rights were soon nullified. In a lengthy monologue the king revealed the existence of a son whose birth was at the sacrifice of the mother. Basilio's astrological studies had indicated that Segismundo would be a cruel and impious monarch who would divide the kingdom and force his own father to be subdued at his feet. He therefore incarcerated this child in a tower, where only Clotaldo had seen or spoken to him. He had since decided to free Segismundo on the grounds that one's disposition and the stars only incline the will, they do not force it:

> porque el hado más esquivo,
> la inclinación más violenta,
> el planeta más impío,
> solo el albedrío inclinan,
> no fuerzan el albedrío. (Calderón, p. 631)

Segismundo would be given the opportunity to negate his horoscope and reign as king. If his horoscope were to prove true, he would be returned to his prison, and the crown shared by Astolfo and Estrella whom the king would unite in marriage. Clotaldo's dilemma was thus resolved by the king's announcement as it no longer mattered that Rosaura had seen Segismundo, and he consequently decided not to confess that he was Rosaura's father. He questioned Rosaura about her proposed revenge and discovered that Astolfo, the duke of Moscow, was the subject, and that this person disguised in male clothing was a woman.

At the onset of Act II, Clotlado relates how he had given an herbal potion to Segismundo to induce sleep and allow him to be brought to the palace and placed in the king's bed. Basilio had chosen this precautionary method in order to maintain the option of returning Segismundo

to his prison, on the pretense that all had been a dream. Segismundo thus awakened to find himself in a sumptuous palace surrounded by music and servants. Clotaldo explained that he was heir to the throne of Poland and that his father, the king, would explain further. The proud prince angrily condemned Clotaldo to death at his hands for his prior cruelty, knowing who he was. Clotaldo escaped, warning the prince that he was dreaming. Segismundo's introduction to the court continued. Clarín won the prince's favor by defending him; Astolfo offended him by his arrogance; Estrella dazzled him by her beauty; and an arrogant servant who three times questioned his judgment was hurled to his death from a balcony. He bitterly criticized the king for having reared him as a beast, treated him as a monster, and solicited his death. Segismundo was warned a second time to be humble for he was perhaps only dreaming, but again refused to heed this advice. Rosaura, who was by this time one of Estrella's attendants, also astonished the prince with her beauty. She recognized him at once, and he felt he had seen her, but was unable to identify when or where. When she attempted to leave his presence, he became annoyed and threatened to dishonor her. Clotaldo intervened and was on the verge of being killed when Astolfo arrived. The king entered as they dueled and was informed by Segismundo that he would see him at his feet for he had not yet avenged the king's cruel manner of rearing him. The king subsequently decided that Segismundo would be returned to prison.

In the following scene, Estrella instructed Rosaura to wait for Astolfo who had departed in search of a mysterious portrait that she had requested. Rosaura was thus unable to avoid meeting her former lover. She was unmoved by Astolfo's entreaties, and regained her por-

trait after a physical struggle. Segismundo had meanwhile been returned to his prison tower in a drug-induced sleep. He awakened to discover himself in his former state of misery, and relayed to Clotaldo the vengeance he had enacted in his dreams. Clotaldo's counsel that one should do good even in dreams motivated the famous soliloquy which concludes Act II and summarizes the thesis of the play--life is a dream:

> ¿Qué es la vida? Un frenesí.
> ¿Qué es la vida? Una ilusión,
> una sombra, una ficción,
> y el mayor bien es pequeño:
> que toda la vida es sueño,
> y los sueños sueños son. (Calderón, p. 668)

Act III opens with a touch of humor. Clarín who had been concurrently imprisoned because of his knowledge of Segismundo, was believed to be the prince by soldiers who broke in to free their rightful heir. He accepted his newly designated role reflecting that this must be a custom in this kingdom and that they must call all their false princes Segismundo. When the true Segismundo was discovered, Clarín pointed out to the soldiers that it was they who had designated him "Segismundo." (Calderón, p. 671)

These soldiers offered the throne to the true prince who initially refused. His cautious acceptance acknowledged that care must be taken in dreams, for one has to awaken. He informed Clotaldo of his intention to heed his advice by doing good: "Que estoy soñando, y que quiero / obrar bien, pues no se pierde / el hacer bien, aun en sueños." (Calderón, p. 675) He thus accepted command of this army of soldiers. Astolfo vowed to overcome the kingdom's resistance to his rule by merit; and Basilio pledged to personally vanquish his ungrateful son. Rosaura

meanwhile revealed to Clotaldo her determination to defend her honor by killing the duke, even though it would mean her death. With sword and dagger, she encountered Segismundo for the third time. She recalled the circumstances of their previous meetings, and disclosed her identity. She related that she had been born at the court of Moscow to a beautiful and noble woman whose lover had deserted her. Destined to misfortune and misery as was her mother, Rosaura's honor and reputation had been violated by Astolfo. She had subsequently donned man's dress and arms and come to the Polish court to seek vengeance. Segismundo's decision comprised his initial desire to subdue her, followed by his recognition that he risked the loss of divine glory were he to submit to human vanity. He accepted his obligation as prince to restore Rosaura's honor. Without looking at her, he hurriedly departed to avoid the risk of temptation, stating that his deeds would speak for him and that he regarded her honor, not her beauty:

> No te responde mi voz,
> porque me honor te responda;
> no te hablo, porque quiero
> que te hablen por mí mis obras,
> no te miro, porque es fuerza,
> en pena tan rigurosa,
> que no mire tu hermosura
> quien ha de mirar tu honra. (Calderón, p. 690)

Clarín who had attempted to escape death by hiding among the rocks, fell mortally wounded at Basilio's feet. His final words, "mirad que vais a morir / si está de Dios que muráis" (Calderón, p. 692), were an unintentional lesson for the king. Clotaldo amplified this lesson by indicating to the king that Christian determination did not accept the

idea that destiny's anger was without recourse. In the following scene, the defeated king knelt at his son's feet imploring him to take revenge. Segismundo chastised the king for having made him a brute by his futile attempt to counter destiny. He counseled that vengeance and justice angered fortune which could be conquered only with wisdom and temperance, and that his greatest accomplishment was to have that day vanquished the self. His first action as king was to give Astolfo Rosaura's hand in marriage. To Astolfo's protest that he would be dishonored by marrying a woman who did not know who she was, Clotaldo responded that she was his daughter. To compensate Estrella's loss, Segismundo announced that he would himself marry her. The rebellious soldier who had released Segismundo from the tower was nonetheless a traitor, and was consequently sentenced to life in the tower. The play ends with Segismundo's recapitulation of the thesis that life is but an ephemeral moment which passes like a dream and must subsequently be wisely and fully lived:

> pues asi llegué a saber
> que toda la dicha humana
> en fin pasa como un sueño,
> y quiero hoy aprovecharla
> el tiempo que me durare:
> pidiendo de nuestras faltas
> perdón, pues de pechos nobles
> es tan propio el perdonarlas. (Calderón, p. 697)

"La Vie n'est qu'un songe"

Boisrobert's nouvelle makes no attempt to disguise the identity of his source. The author maintains those names which were easily adaptable to the French language with a change of letters. He changes

the name Astolfo to Federic, and alters his character to a more negativistic role. He combines the characters of Estrella and Rosaura into one homogeneous role. G. Hainsworth mistakenly equates the roles of Estrella and Sophonie, while contending that Boisrobert suppressed that of Rosaura: "Boisrobert garde les noms propres employés par Calderón, à l'exception d''Astolfo' et d''Estrella,' qui deviennent 'Federic' et 'Sophonie' [sic] ; il supprime les rôles de Clarín et de Rosaura."[13] As Marie Malkiewicz accurately illustrates, Boisrobert combined the roles of Estrella and Rosaura into one consistent character. Malkiewicz views this reduction of the two roles into a single character as the act of a true classicist:

> Agissant en véritable classique, il retranche l'épisode de Rosaura. Des deux femmes, il fera un seul personnage qu'il appellera Sophonie; il lui donnera les traits des deux héroïnes de Calderón et il concentrera sur elle tout l'intérêt--pour ne pas dire tout l'amour--de Sigismond.[14]

Boisrobert eliminates the character of the gracioso, whose role was of minor importance in the comedia. Albert E. Sloman has indicated the relevance of Clarín's role to the thesis of La Vida es sueño. Analogous to Segismundo, Basilio, and Astolfo, Clarín is undeceived. His cowardice and over-confidence result in his death. Sloman equates Clarín's attempt to avoid his own fate with Basilio's effort to avert the catastrophic astrological prediction.[15] Clarín's dying words on the futility of attempting to avoid one's fate are a lesson in the king's psychological development.

The following scheme clearly illustrates the correspondence of names and roles in the comedia and nouvelle:

La Vida es sueño	"La Vie n'est qu'un songe"
Basilio (King of Poland)	Basile (King of Poland)
Segismundo (Prince)	Sigismond or Sigismont (Prince)
Astolfo (Duke of Moscow)	Federic (Duke of Moscow)
Clotaldo (King's minister; Segismundo's attendant; Rosaura's father)	Clotaldo (King's minister; Sigismond's attendant)
Estrella (King's niece)	Sophonie (King's niece)
Rosaura (beautiful Moscovite)	---
Clarín (gracioso)	

Boisrobert's exposition synopsizes in narrative form the explanatory background presented in Calderón's La Vida es sueño, and adds a digression on Polish succession. Basile, king of Poland and knowledgeable astronomer had had only daughters from his first marriage. His astrological forecasts had promised a son in the second, a detail not found in Calderón. Shortly before the child's birth, Basile was warned by the stars that his son would cost the life of his mother at birth, and would one day be a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant who would drive his father from the throne:

> il connut par ses supputations que les Astres coniurez contre son enfant naissant le menaçoient d'estre vn iour le plus cruel Tyran & le plus sanguinaire Prince du monde, & qu'en naissant il cousteroit la vie à sa mere & que quand il seroit paruenu en âge d'homme, il feroit la guerre à son pere & le chasseroit de son throsne, iusques-là qu'il se verroit reduit à luy demander la vie en suppliant. (Boisrobert, p. 445)

Boisrobert's description is more realistic and classical, omitting the poetically supernatural elements depicted by Calderón. At Segismundo's birth, which the comedia compares to the death of Christ, there was a horrendous eclipse, the skies darkened, buildings trembled, rocks fell from the skies, and the rivers bled. (Calderón, p. 629) Boisrobert's text deletes the majority of passages expressing Calderón's

supernatural preoccupation with a cosmic battle. The nouvelle consistently strives to attain the basic tenet of classicism: logical progression of a unified theme. Boisrobert further alters the text by chronologically relocating one quote by Basilio and modifying his motivation. The Spanish text states that the king decided to incarcerate the beast that had been born in order to see if wisdom had dominion over the stars:

> determiné de encerrar
> la fiera que había nacido,
> por ver si el sabio tenía
> en las estrellas dominio. (Calderón, p. 630)

Basilio erred in this action, for the beast in Segismundo was not extant at birth but the direct result of his incarceration. Only in retrospect did Basilio ponder that the stars can influence but not force free will. Basile's similar reflection occurred before the incarceration of his son, and was intended as a prudent method to conquer destiny:

> il pensa toutefois que les Astres inclinoient à la vérité, mais qu'ils ne forçoient point, il n'auoit point oublié le Prouerbe, qui dit que l'homme sage dominera sur les Astres, il fit mille sçauantes reflexions sur la vanité de sa Science & iugeant que la prudence humaine estoit plus forte que celle du Destin. . . . (Boisrobert, p. 445)

Boisrobert softens the motivation of imprisonment as well as the incarceration itself. The prison was not Calderón's isolated tower, but a subterranean palace located beneath the king's chateau. The prince had in Clotalde an attendant analogous to the Spanish Clotaldo. As in the comedia, Clotalde was the only person who knew the king's secret. Boisrobert omits the masked soldiers who were never allowed to view the

prince, and instead provides his protagonist with tutors who were capable of producing the perfect prince. Boisrobert's feeble justification for chaining the prince and dressing him in hides was intended primarily to disguise his birth. The prisoner nonetheless recognized that in spite of his bizarre and savage education, he was instructed and nourished as a person of quality. He often asked his identity, but succeeded in learning only that he had been baptized Sigismond and, a fact unknown to his Spanish counterpart, that he was of illustrious birth.

Boisrobert's king had, as had Calderón's, publicized that his son had died at birth. His nephew, Federic, Duke of Moscow, thus considered himself the legitimate successor, whereas Sophonie, his niece and daughter of the king's elder sister, believed that she was the rightful heir. The king, upon falling ill, was astonished to find that one dreamed of succeeding him while he was still alive, and even more so upon recognizing that his subjects were already choosing sides.

In formulating his decision to free Segismundo, Calderón's king acknowledged that the heavens did not lie, but that man dominated the stars. Segismundo's release was thus a test to see whether he as an individual would vanquish destiny or yield to its powers. Boisrobert's king had a different motivation. He judged that the austere education his son had received in the twenty years he had been in the world sufficed to divert the evil influence of the stars:

> & croyant que depuis vingt ans que son fils estoit au monde, il auoit assez suffisamment pourueu à sa seureté, & que par son austere education il pourroit auoir destourné la maligne influence des Astres, il pensa qu'il estoit temps de le declarer & de le découurir à ses sujets. . . . (Boisrobert, p. 455)

He thus summoned his subjects to announce the existence of his son, and to chastise simultaneously his nephew and niece for their hasty claim to the throne, a detail without precedent in the Spanish play. Basile's exaggerations of the precautions which had been taken to prevent the evil of the stars, and the exceptional if bizarre education his son had received are also a unique sequel to his Spanish source. To the king's surprise, the announcement of the prince's existence was well received and generally approved by the convocation. The king's chancellor suggested that a potion be given to Sigismond and that in his sleep he be carried to one of the most beautiful appartments in the palace and appropriately dressed. He was awakened to music and was pleasantly suprised to hear this beautiful art which he had only known in theory. The Spanish prince was on the contrary annoyed by the music, recalling the military music to which he had been subjected. Upon awakening, Segismundo passed immediately from astonishment to angry pride. Boisrobert allows his protagonist time to savor the pleasures of pleasant music, elegant clothing, exquisite meats, delicate wines, and most important, a beautiful princess. As he imagined himself to be dreaming, Sigismond passively accepted each new event for fear that these pleasures would vanish were he to question their reality. Sophonie represents the combination of the two Spanish heroines, Estrella and Rosaura, into one homogeneous character. Boisrobert thus eliminates the conflict of desire present in Segismundo. The Spanish prince in effect expressed a stronger passion for Rosaura than for Estrella, but the restoration of order demanded that in order to regain her honor, Rosaura had to marry the man who had violated it. Segismundo subsequently elected to marry Estrella for the

express purpose of appeasing her loss of the duke. Boisrobert's Sophonie was the first woman Sigismond had ever seen, and both prince and princess were visibly touched upon beholding one another. Calderón's prince rhetorically praised Estrella's beauty, but there was no indication of a reciprocal attraction such as that felt by Boisrobert's two characters:

> Il vit ie ne sçay quoy dans son air & dans son visage qui luy plut infiniment, & fit quelques pas pour aller au deuant d'elle, auec vn transport qui parut assez visible; la Princesse de son costé découurit en luy ie ne sçay quel charme qui luy plut d'abord, leurs coeurs se rencontrerent aussi bien que leurs yeux & leur émotion fut reciproque. (Boisrobert, pp. 472-473(

Sigismond appeared more eloquent than all the novels he had read, and the pleasure of Sophonie's presence resulted in his wish that this beautiful dream would last eternally. Only after having wined, dined, and enjoyed the company of the beautiful princess did Clotalde enter and the prince's mood alter. Boisrobert justifies his protagonist's chastisement of Clotalde for having hidden his identity from him. The prince reasoned that had he been confided in, he would have born more easily the sorrow of his bizarre education. This rationality is not to be found in Calderón, although both protagonists analogously accused their former attendant of treason. Segismundo unhesitatingly condemned his keeper to death. The more moderate Sigismond initially ordered Clotalde permanently out of his sight. Only when provoked by Clotalde's protestation of innocence did he threaten his life. He would have stabbed Clotalde had Sophonie not stepped between the two. The actual attempt on Clotalde's life occurs later in the comedia and involves the intervention of Astolfo and not that of Rosaura or

Estrella. Sophonie plays a much more active and primordial role in Sigismond's transformation than do her Spanish counterparts. Boisrobert lengthens Clotalde's warning that the prince was only dreaming:

> Sigismont luy cria Clotalde, prenez garde à vous, tout ce qui vous paroist icy d'effectif & de veritable, n'est qu'vn songe, vous resuez cette grandeur imaginaire qui vous ébloüit, & demain quand vous serez esueillé vous me demanderez pardon de vostre emportement & de vos extrauagances. (Boisrobert, p. 479)

Unlike his more arrogant counterpart, Sigismond responded with fright, and turned to Sophonie for confirmation of his identity:

> Là dessus le Prince s'arreste, s'examine & se considere plus que iamais, & prend la liberté de demander ce qu'il est à la Princesse, ce qu'il ne fait toutefois qu'en tremblant, tant il a peur de n'estre pas digne d'elle. (Boisrobert, p. 479)

The princess confirmed his royal birth, but reproached his anger as unworthy of him. The Spanish prince was similarly reprimanded by Rosaura, but in much more explicit terms and after the prince had murdered a servant by hurling him over the balcony, and had threatened her honor.

Sigismond's next visitor was Prince Federic. The Spanish prince took offense at the fact that Astolfo, emphasizing his nobility, put his hat on upon being introduced. Boisrobert's prince had two additional reasons to dislike Federic: Federic was Sophonie's enemy and his entrance necessitated the princess's departure. Sigismond was thus predisposed to dislike his cousin, and his offense at the fact that the duke covered his head in his presence was prompted more by circumstances than by this isolated action. In his subsequent defense,

Federic revealed the existence of Sigismond's father, a fact which in the comedia was disclosed by Clotaldo in conjunction with the revelation of the prince's identity. Sigismond was infuriated by the realization that his father had allowed him to be reared in such a cruel and outrageous manner. He accused Federic of having attempted to usurp his crown, threatened to have him decapitated, and further threatened to throw a gentleman who questioned his behavior out the window. At this point, the king entered. Unlike the Spanish protagonist who reacted with emotional detachment and disinterest upon meeting his father, Sigismond was touched by the king's demeanor. He removed his hat and greeted his father with humility:

> il iugea d'abord que ce deuoit estre le Roy son pere & par vn mouuement secret que luy inspira à mesme temps la Nature, il luy tira le chapeau & le salua auec assez d'humilité. (Boisrobert, p. 485)

In the nouvelle as in the comedia, the king's first words concerned the prince's behavior since learning of his identity. In the comedia, however, Segismundo had already killed a man, whereas the French protagonist had only threatened. The Spanish prince arrogantly declared his indifference to his father's affections. He criticized him for having reared him as a beast, and insolently declared his natural right to the throne irrespective of any debt owed the king:

> Pues en eso
> ¿qué tengo que agradecerte?
> Tirano de mi albedrío,
> si viejo y caduco estás,
> ¿muriéndote, qué me das?
> ¿Dasme más de lo que es mío?
> Mi padre eres y mi rey;
> luego toda esa grandeza
> me da la naturaleza

por derecho de su ley. (Calderón, p. 650)

Sigismond similarly denounced the king for the upbringing he had received, but responded with greater rationality and temperance. Boisrobert's protagonist reasoned that his father was responsible for his present behavior, and he declared his intention to avenge his upbringing if the king did not provide acceptable justification. Without awaiting the king's response, he concluded that no justification could exist for incarcerating an innocent child, and that he had been punished for crimes his father had committed. He threatened that were it true that he was now master of this state, the king would repent his unnatural action:

> Car ie vous declare que ie cherche à me vanger si vous ne me faites connoistre par des raisons bien solides que i'estois digne de mes chaines, mais comment vn Prince innocent peut-il meriter des supplices dés le berceau, & comment me peut-on persuader, s'il est vray que ce soit vous seul qui ayez offensé le Ciel, que ie doiue estre puny pour vos crimes? . . . Car si par quelque secrette prouidence ou par quelque resolution que ie ne puis conceuoir, ie suis effectiuement Maistre de cet Estat, asseurez vous que dans peu vous vous repentirez de m'auoir exposé à tant de mespris en pere denaturé, & de m'auoir condamné à vne captiuité si cruelle. (Boisrobert, pp. 487-488)

Calderón's king responded to his son's haughty accusation with the warning that he be humble, for he was perhaps only dreaming:

> mira bien lo que te advierto,
> que seas humilde y blando,
> porque quizá estás soñando,
> aunque ves que estás despierto. (Calderón, p. 651)

Upon Basilio's departure, Segismundo considered his father's words and concluded that he was not dreaming and that he knew who and what he was:

"No sueño . . . sé quién soy . . . y sé que soy un compuesto de hombre y fiera." (Calderón, p. 651) Boisrobert's king issued not a warning but an unequivocal contention that Sigismond's present grandeur was only a dream, and the author deletes Segismundo's meditation on the reality of his awareness:

> Vous resuez Prince, luy dit le Roy, cette authorité dont vous vous flattez, & cette grandeur que vous vous figurez n'est qu'imaginaire, vous trouuerez demain à vostre resueil que vous aurez fait vn beau songe, & vous rêuerez sans doute encore dedans vos premiers liens. (Boisrobert, p. 488)

Basile regretted his decision to release his son, and it was decided that Sigismond would be returned to his prison with the aid of the same sleeping potion previously used in bringing him to the palace.

The Spanish text contains a secondary plot which, in keeping with classical doctrine, is not reproduced in the nouvelle. Boisrobert simplifies the action by combining the roles of Rosaura and Estrella, thereby eliminating the comedia's quadrangle of the two women, Astolfo, and Segismundo. Boisrobert's simplified version concentrates on the love between the prince and Sophonie. He further omits an attempt on Clotaldo's life, and a duel with Astolfo, followed by a second encounter with the king resulting in his decision to reimprison the prince. The French text focuses instead on Sigismond's epicurean pleasures and his overindulgence in wine which in itself would have brought on a narcotic stupor:

> Comme dans le dernier repas qu'il fit dans cet appartement si superbe on luy auoit servi des vins de liqueur les plus exquis qui se trouuassent dans ces contrées, & que presque par tout on y auoit meslé de cette poudre, il en but auec tel excez que la seule vertu du vin eust pû faire ce qu l'on cherchoit à faire par cette poudre. (Boisrobert, pp. 490-491)

The prince thus awoke in prison, and as in the original text, his father secretly listened to the threats of vengeance he cried out while dreaming. Upon awakening, Clotalde similarly questioned him about his dream and forcefully denied its reality. The concept of the dream is expanded in the nouvelle, and the philosophical elaboration presented in the subsequent conversation between Clotalde and Sigismond is largely without precedence in the comedia. Sigismond similarly relayed the details of what he had dreamed to Clotalde and speculated that this dream had probably been inspired by their discussion of foreign customs the previous day. He commented on various literary interpretations of dreams, and theorized that his atrocious behavior stemmed from his belief that as king, all was permitted. Sigismond was counseled by Clotalde in more explicit fashion than was his Spanish counterpart who was simply warned to do good even in dreams. "Segismundo: que aun en sueños, / no se pierde el hacer bien." (Calderón, p. 668) Clotalde's remonstrance included the additional contention that cruel dreams did not suit the well-born "honnête homme," and a reflection on the vanity of life and the vindication after death of both actions and evil dreams:

> Apprenez, Sigismont, que tous nos projets ne sont que chimere, que foiblesse & que vanité, que pour l'ordinaire l'homme se trompe & se mesconte en veillant aussi bien qu'il fait en dormant, & que sa vie n'est qu'vn songe. Apprenez encore qu'aprés nostre mort qui sera le temps auquel nous nous resueillerons veritablement de ce profond sommeil, nous rendrons conte de toutes nos actions, & que l'on examinera iusques à nos mauuais songes. (Boisrobert, p. 501)

Sigismond was touched by Clotalde's counsel, and promised to moderate his conduct in the future, to commit no evil action either awake or

asleep, and to consider his life as if it were only a dream.

Boisrobert thus increases the importance of the role played by Clotalde in the tutelage of the prince, and allows the king to listen to the above conversation in its entirety. In the comedia, Basilio departs in despair upon hearing the threats his son utters while still sleeping, and never reconsidered voluntarily releasing him. Boisrobert's king was extremely pleased by the prince's enlightenment, and resolved to assemble his nobles in three days in order to name him successor. The prince meanwhile retained such a vivid impression of the different persons he had met, and in particular of Sophonie, and of the different meals he had eaten and wines he had drunk, that he concluded that it might not have been a dream. Clotalde would tell him only that his captivity would soon end and his questions be answered, all details without precedence in the comedia.

Sigismond continued to contemplate the reality of his dream and concluded that one had possibly wanted to test him and that had he exhibited more moderation and control, he would have perhaps been allowed to enjoy these beautiful reveries:

> il pensa qu'il pouuoit bien estre qu'on l'auoit voulu esprouuer, & que s'il eust tesmoigné plus de moderation & de retenuë, il iouïoiroit peut-estre solidement de ses belles resueries & seroit Monarque en effet. (Boisrobert, p. 507)

He determined to subdue his arrogance and correct his bad habits. He reasoned, as a result of Clotalde's tutelage, that man's life was a dream to be awakened only by death:

> Qu'il voit bien par l'expérience qu'il en a faite, que la vie de l'homme n'est qu'vn songe, & que tous les viuants de quelque condition qu'ils puissent estre en ce monde, ne font autre

> chose qu'y resuer iusques à ce que la mort les resueille. (Boisrobert, p. 508)

The ratiocination of Boisrobert's protagonist is comparable in content if not in poetic genius to the famous soliloquy in the Spanish comedia. Segismundo reasoned that life was a dream awakened only by death: "que el vivir solo es soñar /. . . que ha de dispertar / en el sueño de la muerte." (Calderón, p. 668) The thesis of the play can be found in the concluding verses of this soliloquy:

> ¿Qué es la vida? Un frenesí.
> ¿Qué es la vida? Una ilusión,
> una sombra, una ficción,
> y el mayor bien es pequeño:
> que toda la vida es sueño,
> y los sueños sueños son. (Calderón, p. 668)

Boisrobert reproduces in prose form the major portion of Segismundo's soliloquy which he enriches with supplemental rationalization:

> Enfin, il conclud que la vie n'est qu'vne illusion, qu'vne chimere & qu'vne ombre qui passe vite, que le plus grand bien qu'on y gouste n'est que du vent, & que comme les songes sont trompeurs & pleins de mensonge, il a pitié de ceux qui s'y fient, & qui fondent leurs esperances sur ces vanitez. (Boisrobert, p. 510)

Following the prince's return to prison, there suddenly arose three parties within the kingdom. The first consisted of a cabal organized by Federic and the second was comprised of Sophonie's supporters. Certain members of these first two parties proposed the marriage of Federic and Sophonie to resolve their differences. The third and strongest party was composed of those supporting the prince as legitimate heir. The king was inexplicably intimidated by the menaces of Federic's supporters and yielded to their power. Federic had three

requests: first, that he be recognized as successor following the king's death; second, that Sophonie be given to him in marriage; and third, that Sigismond be transported outside the kingdom or at least to a neutral country.

The source of this passage is found in the comedia, but the supplemental details are innovative. The Spanish text similarly contains a cabal led by Astolfo and the king, and a second party which released the prince from prison, proclaiming him the rightful heir. In both texts the role of a woman is fundamental in determining the outcome. Calderón's protagonist recognized his responsibility as prince to restore Rosaura's honor, and the fulfillment of this decision constituted his triumph over the self:

> Pues que ya vencer aguarda
> mi valor grandes victorias,
> hoy ha de ser la mas alta
> vencerme a mí. --Astolfo dé
> la mano luego a Rosaura,
> pues sabe que de su honor
> es deuda, y yo he de cobrarla. (Calderón, p. 696)

Boisrobert's heroine represented an even stronger influence. She not only categorically refused Federic's hand in marriage, but also resolutely declared her support of Sigismond and her intention to die for his cause. The result of her action was the election of Sigismond as king by the combined forces of the two parties.

The motivation for the prince's election is analogous to, but more rationally explained than, that in the comedia. In both texts, the masses refused to accept the sovereignty of a foreign prince, once aware of the existence of a natural king. The nouvelle, however, emphasizes the king's unworthiness to rule based upon the horrible in-

justice his idle imagination had committed against his own blood:

> qu'ils souffriroient moins encore que ce Prince fort bien né à ce qu'en publioient ceux qui l'auoient veu, fust relegué dans vne prison perpetuelle sans auoir commis aucun crime, pendant que des Tyrans regneroient, que puisque le Roy sur des imaginations chimeriques auoit esté capable de faire vne si horrible iniustice à son propre sang, il estoit indigne d'estre leur Roy. (Boisrobert, p. 519)

Sigismond was thus released from prison, and the rationale of his original incarceration fully explained. Boisrobert's text explicitly condemns the injustice of the king's actions as illustrated by the above passage, and the nouvelle derides the comedia's supernatural preoccupation with a cosmic battle. The comedia contains no direct condemnation of the king for having believed in an astrological prediction. The Spanish text emphasizes instead the opposition to a foreign successor:

> tu padre, el gran rey Basilio,
> temeroso que los cielos
> cumplan un hado, que dice
> que ha de verse a tus pies puesto,
> vencido de ti, pretende
> quitarte acción y derecho
> y dársele a Astolfo, duque
> de Moscovia. Para esto
> juntó su corte, y el vulgo,
> penetrando y sabiendo
> que tiene rey natural
> no quiere que un extranjero
> venga a mandarle. (Calderón, p. 672)

When at the end of the text the prince chastises the brutal incarceration he had suffered at his father's hands, the condemnation is again not of the belief in an astrological warning, but of the vengeful and thus destructive manner in which the king had chosen to deal with this prediction.

The protagonists in both texts initially refuse the reality of their second release from prison, but Boisrobert modifies both tone and philosophical thesis. The Spanish prince firmly denied any wish for false grandeur and ostentatious illusions as he knew that life was a dream:

> Ya os conozco, ya os conozco.
> Y sé que os pasa lo mesmo
> con cualquiera que se duerme:
> para mí no hay fingimientos;
> que, desengañado ya,
> sé bien que la vida es sueño. (Calderón, p. 673)

Boisrobert's protagonist analogously stated that he knew man's life was only a dream, and that he renounced imaginary grandeur, but the abbot adds a touch of sardonic humor to this passage. Sigismond further requested that one cease troubling his sleep, that he did not want to be abused a second time, and that, in brief, he no longer wished to believe in dreams:

> que l'on cessast donc de le troubler en son repos, qu'il ne vouloit pas estre desabusé pour la seconde fois, & qu'en vn mot il ne vouloit plus croire aux songes. (Boisrobert, p. 525)

The response to Sigismond's obstinancy was equally unheroic. He was informed that one did not have the leisure to further explain, as it was time to act, not to reason. The prince continued to believe that appearances were deceiving and he would see only chains upon awakening. Having been instrumental in obtaining Sigismond's release from prison, Sophonie now appeared to offer him not only the crown but possession of her heart as well. The prince was eager to accept, but feared the evanescence of this beautiful dream. Pressured to action by

both his soldiers and the princess, he determined to act as though this feigned grandeur were real. His march upon the king had barely begun when Clotalde appeared and fearfully threw himself at his feet. The prince reassured him, stating his intention to follow Clotalde's previous counsel to act with temperance even in dream. Upon learning of Clotalde's fidelity to the king, Sigismond was momentarily outraged but quickly regained his composure and praised his former attendant's faithfulness. The king meanwhile regretted his foolish adherence to an astrological vision, and blamed himself for the present disorder. Clotalde returned with the prince's message to respect neither the king's dignity nor blood, as the king had respected neither in his own son. Greatly outnumbered, the king retired to the tower, [sic] and Federic was killed in battle, a detail not found in the comedia. Sigismond was surprised to discover the princess, who declared her aspiration to his heart and not his crown, fighting by his side. Acknowledging his defeat, the king threw himself at his son's feet. The prince was touched by his father's misery, gently lifted the king, and crying with tenderness himself fell to his father's feet:

> Le Prince touché de compassion de la misere d'vn si grand Roy qui estoit l'autheur de sa vie, le releue amoureusement, pleure de tendresse en le releuant, & se laisse tomber luy mesme à ses pieds pour luy marquer que tout victorieux qu'il estoit, il sentoit qu'il estoit coupable d'auoir blessé la nature en tirant l'espée contre celuy sans lequel il ne seroit rien. (Boisrobert, p. 545)

This scene is markedly different in tone and content from that found in the original. The conversion of Calderón's protagonist is not that of an emotional romanesque hero, but of a lucid and rational prince. Segismundo criticized his father's actions and denounced him as solely

responsible for his son's beastly transformation:

> Mi padre, que está presente,
> por excusarse a la saña
> de mi condición, me hizo
> un bruto, una fiera humana; (Calderón, p. 694)

The transfiguration of the prince from brutish animalism to lucid rationalism consisted precisely in his awareness that man's destiny is conquered not by injustice and vengeance, but by wisdom and temperance:

> la fortuna no se vence
> con injusticia y venganze,
> porque antes se incita más;
> y así, quien vencer aguarda
> a su fortuna, ha de ser
> con cordura y con templanza. (Calderón, p. 695)

The prince's subsequent decision to forgive his father was based not upon compassion for the state of misery to which the king had been reduced, but upon a lucid calculation. His decree that Astolfo must marry Rosaura and that he would marry Estrella, was analogously based on rationality. The Spanish protagonist denied emotionalism for the express purpose of restoring honor and subsequently rendering the restoration of order in the kingdom.

Boisrobert's text exhibits minimal interest in the restoration of honor or order and emphasizes instead the romanesque nature of the prince's bizarre imprisonment and eventual rise to power. Instead of the criticism of the king found in the comedia, Sigismond praised his father for the excellent instruction he had received while in prison and credited him with having ultimately taught him to conquer his passions:

> & par vne docte & tres-éloquente Harangue, il fait voir que quelque traittement qu'il ait receu de son pere dans la prison, il ne la [sic] pas abandonné comme on se l'est imaginé faussement, puis qu'il l'a fait si bien instruire, & que par la connoissance qu'il luy a donnée de la Philosophie, il luy a si bien enseigné à vaincre ses passions, & à se moderer dans la prosperité de sa fortune. (Boisrobert, p. 546)

The prince indicated that his own example of generosity and piety had proven more efficacious than the deceptive science chosen by the king. He stated his intention to reign only after his father's death. The aged king, however, expressed his firm desire to deliver the throne to a prince who had so markedly illustrated his courage and justice. The prince accepted after an initial resistance, and to exemplify his submission and obedience to the king, he asked for Sophonie's hand in marriage. The kingdom was thus substantially enlarged with this union and even more so with a subsequent acquisition of the territory acquired upon Federic's death:

> Quoy que le Prince à ce coup parust le Maistre, il voulut encore donner des marques de sa soûmission & de son obeyssance, en suppliant le Roy son pere de luy donner en mariage le Princesse de Lithuanie sa cousine qui ioignit ses Estats à ceux d'vn si grand Royaume, que l'on vit encore accru quelques iours aprés de la Couronne de Moscouie par la mort du Duc Federic. (Boisrobert, p. 550)

Conclusion. Calderón's La Vida es sueño belongs to the same genre as does Tirso's Palabras y Plumas: the comedia. As earlier mentioned, the comedia has been viewed by Reichenberger and other critics as a communal symbolization of the Spanish people: "The individualizing, autobiographical element is almost completely absent in Spanish dramatic literature. . . ."[16] A direct consequence of the emphasis on the

collective enterprise is the subjugation of the individual will to the social order. Reichenberger's contention is that: "a Spanish play follows the pattern from order disturbed to order restored,"[17] resulting in an "almost ritualistic restoration of the social order at the end of the play,"[18] and thus preventing a tragic ending.

La Vida es sueño clearly follows this pattern. Segismundo subjugated his own passion for Rosaura to a social code which demanded the restoration of her honor. As her honor had been violated by Astolfo, it could be restored only by their marriage. Segismundo's subsequent proposal to Estrella was similarly an act to restore her honor which would have otherwise been sacrificed by the marriage of Astolfo, to whom she was affianced, and Rosaura. Marie Malkiewicz appropriately views this union as an act of justice rather than love:

> Ce n'est qu'à regret qu'il cédera enfin à Astolphe, et son mariage avec l'Infante sa cousine sera plutôt un acte de justice qu'une union d'amour.[19]

Critics formerly viewed the subplot of Rosaura's honor as a serious detraction from the unity of the play. Sloman contends that the Rosaura episode: "is so inextricably bound up with Segismundo and given such prominence throughout the play that the whole dramatic structure depends upon it."[20] The two characters are companions in adversity, and their fortunes are interdependent. William Whitby traces the prince's spiritual growth from the first meeting of Rosaura and Segismundo to its crystallization in the final act when Segismundo: "comprehends his own nature in its relation to reality and thenceforth acts in accordance with that knowledge."[21] Rosaura is the key to Segismundo's conversion, and Sloman views his final sacrifice of the woman he loves

for the sake of her honor as the ultimate proof of his conversion.[22]

That Boisrobert failed to see the interdependence of the two roles is hardly surprising. Sloman lists Menéndez y Pelay among critics who have condemned this subplot as a detraction to the play's unity.[23] Boisrobert omits the honor issue, and his nouvelle reproduces none of the above philosophical preoccupations. The French text is far more concerned with what the author perceives as homogeneity of action and thus strives to produce a logical sequence of events. Boisrobert consistently deletes the metaphysical symbolism of the original and derides the king's foolish belief in an astrological prediction. His prince is more temperate than is his Spanish counterpart, and rationlly analyzes momentary outbursts of rage. The nouvelle is the more intellectual text; the comedia, the more philosophical. Boisrobert's adaptation represents the spirit of French individualism; the comedia, of Spanish collectivism. The nouvelle maintains the basic action and theme of the comedia but ingeniously transposes the Spanish text into a work which is totally French in form and in spirit. La Vida es sueño is the masterpiece of the collective essence of Golden Age drama in seventeenth-century Spain. "La Vie n'est qu'un songe" is a clever and sardonic embodiment of the classical spirit in seventeenth-century France.

Notes

[1] Albert E. Sloman, The Dramatic Craftsmanship of Calderón (Oxford: The Dolphin Book Co. Ltd., 1958), pp. 250-277.

[2] Sloman, Dramatic Craftsmanship, p. 252.

[3] Sloman, Dramatic Craftsmanship, pp. 256-277.

[4] Sloman, Dramatic Craftsmanship, p. 254.

[5] Peter Dunn, "The Horoscope motif in La Vida es sueño," Atlante, no. 1 (1953), 187-201.

[6] Dunn, pp. 187-188.

[7] Dunn, p. 190.

[8] Dunn, p. 190.

[9] George Hainsworth, Les "Novelas ejemplares" de Cervantes en France au XVII[e] siècle (1933; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971), p. 198.

[10] Alejandro Cioranescu, "Calderón y el teatro clásico en francés," Estudios de literatura española y comparada (Tenerife, Canary Islands: Universidad de la Laguna, 1954), p. 152.

[11] Cioranescu, p. 152.

[12] Calderón de la Barca, La Vida es sueño, in Diez Comedias del Siglo del Oro, ed. José Martel and Hymen Alpern, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 616.

[13] Hainsworth, p. 198.

[14] Marie Malkiewicz, "Un Remaniement français de 'La Vie est un songe,'" Revue de littérature comparée, 1939, p. 434.

[15] Sloman, Dramatic Craftsmanship, p. 271.

[16] Arnold G. Reichenberger, "Uniqueness of the 'Comedia,'" Hispanic Review, XXVII (1959), p. 305.

[17] Reichenberger, p. 307.

[18] Reichenberger, p. 168.

[19] Malkiewicz, p. 434.

[20] Sloman, "The Structure of Calderón's La Vida es sueño," MLR, 48, No. 3 (1953), 293.

[21] William M. Whitby, "Rosaura's Role in the Structure of La Vida es sueño, HR, 28 (1960), p. 27.

[22] Sloman, "Structure," p. 299.

[23] Sloman, "Structure," p. 293.

Chapter 8

BOISROBERT'S ONLY NOVEL: L'HISTOIRE INDIENNE

Boisrobert's Histoire indienne d'Anaxandre et d'Orazie was published in Paris by François Pomeray in 1629, and has not been republished since. It represents Boisrobert's only attempt to write a novel, a fact that Emile Magne finds unfortunate. In one of the few comments to be found on this work, Magne contends that Boisrobert would have attained greater success had he pursued the romanesque novel rather than the theater:

> Il est regrettable que Boisrobert n'ait pas persévéré dans la voie romanesque. Il y eût assurément mieux réussi qu'au théâtre et son désir de plaire avant tout nous eût dotés de fictions autrement captivantes que celles auxquelles le XVII^e siècle nous habitua. Nous aurions, sans doute, à cette heure, un autre Roman comique ou un autre Francion.[1]

The tremendous success of the theater in the decades immediately following the publication of Boisrobert's novel was undoubtedly a factor in the author's choice of genres. The most successful dramatist was Pierre Corneille, fellow Norman and friend. The two authors, along with Thomas Corneille, d'Ouville, and Scarron, were to introduce a new type of drama, the Spanish comedia. In 1639, the publication of d'Ouville's Esprit folet, an adaptation of Calderón's La Dama duende, was to prove instrumental in acclimating the Spanish comedia in France. In the Galerie du Palais in 1634, Corneille denounced the novel as no

longer fashionable: "Mais on ne parle plus qu'on fasse des Romans, / La mode est à présent aux pièces de théâtre."[2] The influential role of his brother, along with Corneille's denunciation of the novel and Boisrobert's proven interest in the romanesque, could hardly have failed to sway the taste of the opportunistic novelist.

Boisrobert's Histoire indienne is accurately classified by Magne as romanesque. Adam posits the period from 1625 to 1640 as the extreme point of romanesque inspiration, the essential sources being antiquity, Italian novels, and Spanish literature.[3] The novel also bears many of the traits of the extremely long heroic or epic novels popularized in the mid-seventeenth century by Gomberville, La Calprenède, and Madeleine de Scudéry, but already in existence long before these authors. Adam views the years between 1627 and 1632 as an era which, due to political and social causes, turned away from the dramatic pastoral towards the romanesque pastoral. The new generation's taste was for action, heroism, and the spirit of adventure and war:

> Le goût de l'action, l'héroïsme, l'esprit d'aventure et l'esprit guerrier sollicitent la nouvelle génération. Lorsque la guerre sera déclarée, il n'y aura plus de place pour une littérature de bergeries.[4]

Adam contends that the novels of adventure were in vogue from 1620 to 1642, and were most numerous in the years between 1620 and 1629.[5] The novels of adventure gradually developed different romanesque formulas, and evolved into the epic novel. The heros of the epic novel experienced romanesque adventures, but the point of departure of the adventure was history.[6] The romanesque underwent an evolution, and in the epic novels of 1640, it was a transformed romanesque of war

leaders.[7] Adam links this development to the reactionary politics of Richelieu and the European war which exalted military and feudal virtues:

> C'est en France, la politique réactionnaire de Richelieu, et la guerre européenne qui ont, à partir de 1625 et plus encore à partir de 1635, provoqué un développement continu et puissant d'une littérature d'inspiration aristocratique et féodale.[8]

Characteristics of the heroic or epic novel cited by Adam are as follows: the blending of historical events and persons with invented persons and romanesque adventures; the inextricable confusion of politics and sentimentality; banal, conventional psychology.[9] As the analysis section of this chapter will show, the Histoire indienne readily exhibits all the above traits.

The text of Boisrobert's Histoire indienne is preceded by several prefatory letters. The first is an epistle by the author to Mademoiselle d'Effiat praising her beauty and the valor of her father. Boisrobert's alleged innovation in writing this novel is to have described countries which the French had previously known only through Spanish and Dutch intermediaries. The author does not, however, view this innovation as a literary contribution, but rather as a political one. The French are now aware of new realms to conquer:

> Ie croy certainement, MADEMOISELLE, que nous ne demeurerons pas longtemps à deuenir maistres des pays que ie vous d'écris dans ce Liure, & que iusques icy nous nous sommes contentez de connoistre pas la relation des Espagnols, & des Hollandois.[10]

As Richelieu's favorite, Boisrobert had no choice but to support the political policies of the cardinal, and the above statement clearly

confirms Adam's contention that there was a continual and powerful development of a literature of aristocratic and feudal inspiration. Boisrobert's Histoire indienne is thus one of the earliest novels to exalt the emerging aristocratic and feudal political policies.

The epistle to Mademoiselle d'Effiat is followed by an "Advis au lecteur qui servira de preface," in which Boisrobert humbly claims to be no more than the translator of the loves of Anaxandre and the adventures of Alcidaris:

> O voy que ie ne vueille passer icy que pour simple traducteur des amours d'Anaxandre, & des auantures d'Anaxandre, & des auantures d'Alcidaris, & que pour me rendre plus recommandable aupres de toy, ie cherche l'authorité des Arabes & des Indiens. (Boisrobert, "Advis au lecteur qui servira de preface")

Boisrobert adopts the Horatian code of pleasing while instructing, with the emphasis on the reader's pleasure. He states that although his story is true, his concern is not that the reader believes it to be true, but that he is pleased and amused by what he reads in the novel:

> Ie m'asseure, Lecteur, que tu auras bien de la peine à te persuader que cette histoire soit veritable. Quoy qu'il en soit, puisque mon but n'est que de te plaire, & de te diuertir agreablement, il ne m'importe pas beaucoup que tu lises mon liure comme vne Histoire, ou comme vne fable, pourueu que la lecture te contente, & que tu me sçaches quelque gré de te l'auoir donné. (Boisrobert, "Advis")

In effect, the author maintains that the novel, which resembles the epic poem, is more effective than history in teaching one to hate vice and love virtue, for the novelist emphasizes the virtues that the historian merely presents as examples:

> il y a dans les beaux Romans qui tiennent de la nature du Poëme Epyque, aussi bien que dans les Histoires, des instructions propres à toutes sortes d'Estats, pour faire abhorrer le vice & cherir la verty; & d'autant plus encore dans les Romans que celuy qui les escrit se propose toujours la perfection, & met en vn plus eminent degrẽ les vertus dont l'Histoire nous presente les exẽples. (Boisrobert, "Advis")

Historians are, according to Boisrobert, subject to numerous vices, among them that of publishing obliging lies rather than harmful truth. The more admirable authors of epic poems and novels are exempt from this evil, and Boisrobert utilizes an Aristotelian premise in concluding that the epic poem and novel describe actions not as they are, but as they should be:

> Mais ceux qui composent des Poëmes Epyques, & des Romans sont exempts de cette malice noire, & de cette lasche complaisance. Ils descriuent les actions non pas telles qu'elles sont, mais telles qu'elles doivent estre. (Boisrobert, "Advis")

The comparaison originally employed by Aristotle involved Sophocles, who drew men as they ought to be, and Euripides, who drew men as they are.[10] This same Aristotelian differentiation was utilized in the latter part of the seventeenth century by La Bruyère in his well-known comparison of the works of Corneille and Racine. In Boisrobert's comparison of the historian and the novelist, the author contends that the latter is more successful in bringing men to maintain law and reason:

> & mieux qu'eux ils sçauent animer les hommes de coeur à maintenir le droit & la raison iusques au dernier soupir de leur vie. (Boisrobert, "Advis")

This relegation of history to a lower plane is also to be found in Aristotle, who in comparing the realms of history and poetry, found that

of poetry to be the more philosophical and universal:

> The true difference is that one relates what has happened, the other what may happen. Poetry, therefore, is a more philosophical and a higher thing than history: for poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular.[11]

As concerns his own work, Boisrobert, excusing his own lack of poetic talent, purports to have followed true history in relating those events which would give pleasure to the reader, and to have avoided those which would produce shock or displeasure:

> Pour moy qui n'ay pas ces dons de persuader & d'émouuoir, ie me vante pour le moins de tenir cela de la vraye Histoire que ie garde l'ordre des tẽps que ie d'écrits exactement la situation des pays & des regions, & que ie fais connoistre & les moeurs & les ceremonies des peuples, au moins celles qui peuuent donner quelque contentement aux Lecteurs, m'élongnant toujours des choses qui doiuent choquer leur esprit, & qui leur peuuent déplaire. (Boisrobert, "Advis")

Seventeenth-century classicists will later formalize this Horatian principle of decorum into one of the major tenets of French classicism. The concepts expressed in Boisrobert's "Advis au lecteur" are thus a precursor of this literary movement which was to search for rules and models among the early Latin and Greek classicists.

The "Advis au lecteur" is followed by a "Lettre de Monsieur de Balzac escrite a une dame de qualité." The letter is written under the pretext that its author has been unable to see a certain lady and is thus sending her an even better companion than the one he had promised. Balzac sacrifices his own talents to those of Boisrobert in contending that this work will enable the lady to forget the mediocre gift that he had made her of his own writings:

> Il vous dégoustera infailliblement du mauuais present que ie vous ay fait, quand vous me cõmandastes de vous donner quelques-vns de mes escrits. (Boisrobert, "Lettre de Mr de Balzac")

When in 1646 Boisrobert's Epistres en Vers are published, Balzac will severely and unjustly criticize Boisrobert. At the time the Histoire indienne is published, the two men are however on friendly terms, and Balzac's letter lauds Boisrobert's talents. Balzac claims that the Histoire indienne would merit his praise even were the author his enemy, for the work is novel, poetic, and representative of the language of the court:

> Icy, MADAME, ie vous promets que vous verrez de la nouueauté, & que vous entẽdrez parler la vraye langue de la Cour, dont vous auez une si parfaite connoissance. I'auoüe bien qu'en quelques endroits il y a quelque chose qui sent vn peu la Poësie, & qui n'est pas entierement dans la seuerité de nos regles; (Boisrobert, "Lettre de Mr de Balzac)

The portion of Balzac's letter included in the Histoire indienne is supposedly an excerpt from a longer letter, and terminates with the author's promise to relate a pleasant tale. The text of the Histoire indienne is immediately preceded by an "Extraict du priuilege du Roy" granted February 16, 1629, and the publisher's acknowledgment of having received the "Priuilege" from Boisrobert on April 13, 1629.

The novel opens with the death of the young prince, Aronte. He leaves a letter written on his deathbed to his sister, Orazie, in which he requests that she marry Ariomant, who is really Prince Anaxandre. As Orazie has already recognized Anaxandre's undisguisable nobility and has consequently fallen in love with him, she is doubly delighted to learn that he is a prince whose grand reputation is admired by all the

king's subjects:

> Elle auoit tousjours bien jugé qu'Ariomant, dont les actions estoient toutes Royales, devoit auoir des qualitez eminentes; & quoy qu'il s'humiliast tous les iours dans la Cour du Roy son père, elle cognoissoit quelque chose de grand & d'illustre dans ses yeux & dans son courage. (Boisrobert, pp. 13-14)

Anaxandre is accompanied by his noble friend, Piroxene, who bears the disguised name of Calestene. Orazie is in the presence of her cousin, Princess Lisimène, who has been sent by her father to the court of the king of Narsingue. Lisimène is loved by Lisimante, a soldier of fortune whose true identity and birth are unknown, thus making him an unacceptable partner for a king's daughter: "parce que c'estoit une loy generalement receuë par toutes les Indes, qu'une Princesse ne pouvoit s'allier qu'à son égal. . . ." (Boisrobert, p. 24) Lisimène refuses to acknowledge Lisimante's declarations of love. Like Orazie, she too has recognized signs of royalty in her suitor, and consequently fallen in love with him, but she refuses to talk to him: "de crainte que les rares qualitez qu'elle remarquoit en son corps & en son esprit, ne la gaignassent à la longue. . . ." (Boisrobert, p. 40) Orazie values honor above love, and she recommends that Lisimène wait, and perhaps in time the king will reward Lisimante's valorous deeds by granting him her hand in marriage.

In the meantime, Ariomant, who is in love with Orazie, is unaware of Aronte's dying letter to his sister. He resolves to reveal his birth secretly to Orazie. Ariomant, Calistene, Orazie, and Lisimène thus meet in Orazie's chambers, and Ariomant begins the tale of his extraction. This ends the first book of the Histoire indienne. The books that follow will continue Ariomant's tale of the events which

occurred after he and Pyroxene left their native kingdom.

The second begins with the relation of Ariomant's, or Anaxandre's, genealogical descent. Anaxandre is the son of Alcidaris and his second wife, Anaxarete. The king's first wife had died in childbirth leaving a male heir who allegedly died some months later. Calistene, or Pyroxene, is the son of Ametiste, queen of Citor and only sister of Alcidaris. He and Anaxandre were reared together, tutored by the wise governor Euandre. At the age of eighteen, neither young man had yet experienced the slightest twinge of love, until one day Anaxandre saw the portrait of Orazie, and fell madly in love:

> Ie n'eus pas si tost jetté les yeux sur ce beau portraict, que ie sentis une soudaine émotion en mon ame, qui me fut un certain augure de la naissance de mon amour. (Boisrobert, pp. 114-115)

Anaxandre took the portrait with him, and he confessed that it soon became the most important of all his possessions. As a direct result of this portrait, Anaxandre and Pyroxene resolved to undertake the voyage to Narsingue, using the aliases of Taxile and Cleonte. To avoid being followed, they decided to first spend some months in the court of the king of Decan. This king had two sons, Demonax and Araxe, and a daughter, Orixe. The kingdom was in the midst of a nativity celebration. Each brother was in charge of a combat group, and Anaxandre and Pyroxene entered on the side of Araxe, thus provoking the jealousy of Demonax. Demonax also hated his sister, Orixe, for having dared to scorn the suitor he wished her to marry. The situation which arose shortly after the arrival of Anaxandre and Pyroxene in Decan resulted in an imbroglio in which Pyroxene fell in love with Orixe; Orixe, with Anaxandre; while Anaxandre remained faithful to his portrait of the

beautiful Orazie:

> & moy qui auois vôtre image vivement emprainte dans l'ame, & qui estois preoccupé de ce premier desir de me donner à vous; ie ne peus connoistre les charmes ny les attraits de cette Princesse infortunee, qui sans mentir eust esté capable de donner de l'amour à tout autre qu'à moy. (Boisrobert, p. 162)

The princess deceived herself into falsely believing that Anaxandre returned her love and that his silence was the result of fear. She thus placed her own life, as well as that of Anaxandre and Pyroxene, in danger. A rigorous law of the kingdom irrevocably condemned to death any woman of royal blood who abandoned herself to the love of a commoner, and who chose of her own free will an unequal alliance. (Boisrobert, p. 168) Orixe forcibly elicited the aid of her nurse, who in turn chose her own son, Callias, as confidant. She then wrote a letter to Anaxandre in which she confessed her love and proposed marriage. She asked him to meet her that night. Anaxandre decided to send Piroxene in his place, and it was Piroxene who composed the letter accepting Orixe's proposal. The initial rendez-vous occurred as planned, and Piroxene and Orixe spent several ecstatic evenings together. The princess, however, remained totally unaware that her lover was Piroxene. Anaxandre wittily remarks that love's revenge for this deception was to almost kill the two with joy:

> Ie me contenteray de vous dire, au'Amour pour se vanger doucement de la tromperie qu'on luy faisoit, fut plusieurs fois sur le poinct de les faire mourir de ioye. Ils passerēt cinq ou six nuicts en pareilles delices, sans que le pauure Piroxene osast iamais se declarer pour ce qu'il estoit, tant il auoit peur de conuertir en heine l'affection qu'Orixe luy tesmoignoit en le prenant pour moy. (Boisrobert, p. 191)

The couple's honeymoon ended when Callias betrayed them. Like Orixe, Callias also believed that the princess's lover was Anaxandre, and it was this message that he relayed to Demonax. Demonax and Callias subsequently surprised the unsuspecting couple in bed:

> Car Demonax qui au deshonneur mesme de sa Maison, fut bien aise de trouuer ce sujet de vengeance brutale contre sa soeur, qu'il haïssoit extrémement, ne manqua pas de les venir surprendre au lict, conduit par le perfide Callias. . . . (Boisrobert, p. 200)

The result was that Orixe, Pyroxene, and Anaxandre were all condemned to die; the second book ends with the three in route to their execution.

The third book opens with a recognition scene which results in a reversal of the action. Anaxandre related how he was first recognized by one of the Bramins leading their chariot. Then an old man suddenly appeared and confirmed the nobility of Anaxandre and Pyroxene. This old man was their former tutor, Euandre. Aided by an astrological prediction that Anaxandre and Pyroxene would meet a violent death, Euandre decided to search for them and thereby possibly prevent the misfortunes threatened by the stars:

> ie voulus voir si par mes soings & par ma diligence à m'en querir de vous, ie pourrois point destourner les malheurs dont les Astres vous menaçoient. (Boisrobert, p. 274)

The subsequent information relayed by Euandre involved the resuscitation of the king's first-born son as the result of Anaxandre's departure. Following the death of the king's first wife, he had asked for Anaxerete's hand in marriage. Unwilling to tolerate that her children should be second in line, Queen Anaxarete had initially refused the

king's proposal, and accepted his offer only after news that the king's son had died. Angered by Anaxandre's departure, the king confessed that the story of his son's death was only a ruse he had fabricated in order to gain the queen's hand in marriage, and he subsequently sent for this son. The child was unfortunately reared among peasants, and Euandre's told Anaxandre that his presence at court only served to augment the king's chagrin. The queen in particular was unable to suffer this beast whose vicious behavior rendered him detestable to all:

> car ce jeune Prince estoit si mal nourry, & avoit pris parmy ces gens de basse cõdition qui l'avoient eslevé de si mauuaises habitudes, que sa presence ne servit à rien qu'à vous faire dauantage regretter; sur tout la Reine ne pouuoit souffrir qu'en vôtre place on reuerast vn brutal, qui par ses vicieux deportemens se rendoit mẽprisable à tout le monde. (Boisrobert, pp. 271-272)

Anaxandre had believed himself to be the only son of Alcidaris, and his reaction was one of annoyance that this idiot had replaced him as heir to the throne. As the result of Euandre's arrival, Orixe and her father finally learned the truth, not only of Anaxandre and Pyroxene's noble ancestry, but also of their deception in switching identities. Orixe was ultimately persuaded of Pyroxene's love, and Anaxandre states that: "de ce jour Orixe commença de m'aimer comme frere, & non plus comme Amant." (Boisrobert, p. 293)

Meanwhile, Orixe's kingdom was suddenly menaced by a revolt. Her father was killed, and the queen succumbed to her grief. Orixe, who had been gravely ill as the result of previous events, died. Her two brothers, Demonaxe and Araxe were killed, and Anaxandre and Pyroxene left the kingdom. They continued traveling, and in Narsingue, they

saved the life of Prince Aronthe. Shortly after their arrival, a messenger announced that Orixe was alive: "la Princesse Orixe que nous avions pleurée morte, estoit saine, pleine de vie, & plus belle que jamais." (Boisrobert, p. 343) Euandre, who had stayed with Orixe, recommended that the news that she was alive not be divulged. Thus she remained hidden under the disguised name, Asterie. The revolt had spread to the territory of the king of Narsingue, and Anaxandre and Pyroxene accompanied Prince Aronthe in the ensuing war. The prince died, but not before alerting his men to follow Anaxandre and Pyroxene in battle. He then composed the letter to his sister, Orazie, requesting that she marry Anaxandre. Book III thus ends with the completion of Anaxandre's relation of past events.

In the fourth book, the action reverts to the present. Lisimante, who is love with Lisimène, erroneously assumes that Anaxandre is his rival, and resolves to kill him. The resulting duel pits Lisimante and his confidant against Anaxandre and Pyroxene. Anaxandre is first believed dead, and this news is relayed to Orazie by her servant, Saradin. She then learns that he is alive, but as an edict has recently come down forbidding all duels, she decides to spread the news that he is dead. The king is furious that his newly enacted law has been violated, and resolves to take vengeance even on the dead: "il commanda qu'on luy cherchast le corps d'Ariomant pour estre exposé à l'ignominie du supplice." (Boisrobert, p. 421) The action now returns to Anaxandre's father, King Alcidaris. Believing his newly resuscitated son now to be his only heir, King Alcidaris has sent a messenger to the king of Narsingue requesting his daughter's hand in marriage. The young brute, Alcidaris, is no happier with present cir-

cumstances than is his father, and is particularly afflicted by the news that he is to marry Orazie:

> ce qu'ayant apris le ieune Alcidaris, il en pleura comme s'il eust perdu tous ses parens, car il estoit amoureux de la fille d'vn simple bourgeois qu'il vouloit espouser à toute fortune. . . . (Boisrobert, pp. 431-432)

The messenger returns with the news that Anaxandre is alive, and he tells King Alcidaris of the valorous deeds Anaxandre and Pyroxene have performed since leaving their home. Euandre then arrives and tells all he knows of the loves of Anaxandre and Piroxene, and the king resolves to let Anaxandre marry Orazie. Immediately following these events, a foreign ship arrives in port, carrying two knights of noble appearance. Euandre goes to investigate, and discovers Lisimante, who regretfully confesses to having just killed a young Persian knight named Ariomant:

> Il se nommoit Ariomant, dit Lisimante; & bien, dit Euãdre tout effrayé, qu'est-il deuenu, ie l'ay tué respondit Lisimante; & certes ie l'ay regretté depuis, car c'estoit le plus vaillant Cheualier, contre qui ie me sois jamais esprouué. (Boisrobert, p. 472)

Upon hearing these words, Euandre orders Lisimante and his accomplice arrested and brought before the king. The queen determines to cruelly revenge her son's death, and Lisimante is in prison when he recognizes the officer of justice, Evrimede, as the father whose home he had abandoned as a child:

> Mon pere, luy dit-il, est-il possible que vous soyez ce bon & vertueux Eurimede, qui m'a mis au monde, & de qui i'ay porté le nom autrefois? (Boisrobert, p. 515)

The ensuing monologue by Lisimante on the vanity of this world echoes that Segismundo will express in La Vida es sueño:

> cela me fait bien voir, mõ pere, que ce monde n'est que vanité, que sa grandeur, apres qui courent tant d'esprits ambitieux, n'est qu'vne vapeur & qu'vne fumée, qui s'échape des mains quand on la pense mieux tenir, & que toutes ses prosperitez sont fragiles & muables. (Boisrobert, p. 518)

Evrimede then informs Lisimante that not he, but none other than king, Alcidaris is his real father. Entrusted with the care of the king's son, Evrimede had observed the royal mark on Lisimante's arm, and had had the same mark imprinted on his own son's arm. Lisimante's noble bearing is thus in direct correlation with his heritage, as is the base peasantry of the false son:

> Cét enfant, Monseigneur, que ie n'ay plus osé aduoüer pour mien, est celuy qui occupe iniustement aujourd'huy vôtre place, & de qui toute la Cour & le Roy mesme ont de si mauvaises satisfacitons. (Boisrobert, p. 521)

Evrimede presents Lisimante to the king, and confesses his guilt. Lisimante is recognized as the rightful heir to the throne, and at the end of Book IV, Alcidaris forgives his son for the murder he had committed out of ignorance:

> Consolez-vous mon enfant, vous ne sçauriez auoir irrité le Ciel dans votre ignorance, il est plus coupable que vous d'auoir connu vostre dessein, & de ne l'auoir pas destourne. . . .(Boisrobert, p. 538)

Book V opens with the relation of Lisimante's life from the time he abandoned Evrimede's home at the age of ten. Alone at the edge of the sea, he was picked up by pirates, and later sold to a man who then presented him to the king and queen. Pleased by his appearance, the

queen gave him the position of first page of her six year old daughter, Princess Lisimène. Not wishing to admit that he was the son of a merchant, Lisimante confirmed the pirates' statement that he was a lost child they had nourished out of charity. The queen had him named Euribalde. By the time Lisimène was ten, Lisimante, three years her senior, was passionately in love with her. She, however, refused all acknowledgment of this love. As time passed, Lisimante's valorous deeds were rewarded by the king and he was granted a title of nobility. From the princess, he received the name Lisimante. When he was eighteen, Lisimante was placed in charge of a city he had helped capture, and was honored with the title of lieutenant. The king did not, however, favor Lisimante's pursuit of his daughter, and consequently had Lisimène sent to her uncle, the king of Narsingue. As Lisimante relates his story, a messenger arrives and announces that Anaxandre and Pyroxene are alive. Lisimante is doubly consoled to also learn that Anaxandre loves not Lisimène, but Orazie. The false son, upon being dethroned, surprisingly asks for nothing but his "petite bourgeoise" in marriage. Just as all are celebrating the good news, a messenger arrives with the news that the king of Narsingue, who does not believe that Anaxandre and Pyroxene are of noble birth, is going to have them decapitated for having disobeyed his edict forbidding all duels. He refuses to cede to his daughter's lamentations, and banishes her from his presence, ordering that the execution be carried out as planned. Anaxandre and Pyroxene fight their way free and once more narrowly escape death. At this point, the king of Narsingue, having just received confirmation of their identities, arrives. He begs their forgiveness, and confirms Orazie's marriage to Anaxandre.

Piroxene will marry Orixe, and Lisimante, Lisimène. The novel thus ends with all married and living happily ever after.

The author summarizes their respective successions, basing the authenticity of his tale on information reserved in the palace of the present "grand Mogor." (Boisrobert, p. 743) Boisrobert claims to have been given this story by a friend who had traveled in the Orient, and that he then translated it into French:

> Vn de mes amis qui a fait le voyage des Indes Orientales, a tiré cette histoire du cabinet du grand Mogor, que i'ay traduite en nôtre langue; (Boisrobert, p. 746)

The author devotes the concluding pages of the novel to the description of the activities surrounding the wedding festivities. He conjectures that were he to describe all the peculiarities of the Oriental customs, three volumes larger than his present novel would be necessary, and he would cause the author of this admirable story to be suspected of untruth:

> mais comme i'ay déja dit, outre qu'il me faudroit trois volumes plus gros que n'est celuy-cy, si ie voulois d'escrire toutes ces particularitez, ie ferois soupçonner de mensonge l'Autheur de cette admirable histoire. (Boisrobert, p. 760)

Critical information on the Histoire indienne is practically nonexistent. The author's claim that the work is a translation is surely true, but it is highly improbable that he obtained the work from a friend who had traveled in the Orient, and that he translated it into French. This contention would require knowledge of an Oriental language, which Boisrobert certainly did not possess. The more plausible explanation is that the original was in Spanish. This theory is vali-

dated by the text itself. The novel is markedly influenced by Spanish literature. Adam contends that whereas antiquity remained an essential romanesque source and Italian novels were equally known, translated, and exploited, Spanish literature offered both the romanesque and picaresque novels as models. Adam maintains that Spanish literature contributed the most perfect examples of the romanesque: "elle a donné les exemples les plus parfaits du romanesque: aventures invraisemblables, sentiments quintessenciés, atmosphère d'amour, de galanterie, d'héroïsme chevaleresque."[13] Boisrobert's Histoire indienne exhibits marks of both the romanesque and the picaresque genres. The romanesque is overtly dominant. The influence of the picaresque is more subtle, but can be easily perceived in the novel's action. The dance pattern of appearing, disappearing, and reappearing characters with characters believed dead suddenly resuscitated, is typically picaresque, as is the vagabondage and aimless wandering of the protagonists. Both wander from adventure to adventure, with neither attaining substantial psychological development. The ultimate motivation of Boisrobert's protagonists is more elevated than that of the pícaro, but the process is remarkably similar.

The novel contains several episodes which if not of Spanish origin, were received by Boisrobert via Spanish sources. These particular episodes are of particular importance as they involve one of the masterpieces of Spanish drama, Calderón de la Barca's La Vida es sueño. Had Calderón's play pre-dated the Histoire indienne, the matter could easily be reduced to a simple borrowing of information. The problem originates in the fact that the Histoire indienne was published in 1629, six years before the publication of La Vida es sueño. Calderón

did not read French, and obviously did not base his plot on a French source. Yet the parallelism of certain events cannot be overlooked. In La Vida es sueño, the king attempts to avoid an unfavorable astrological prediction that his son, Segismundo, would be a cruel and impious monarch. He incarcerates the infant child in a tower, attended to and tutored by a lone guardian. The son is thus reared in absolute ignorance, and can do no more than display this boorish brutality when first allowed to enter the world. Forced to return to isolation, he meditates on the illusory nature of life. When allowed a second chance, Segismundo repents his heinous behavior and acts with honor and virtue.

In the Histoire indienne, it is the tutor, Euandre, who speaks of preventing the occurrence of an ominous astrological prediction. The omen here, however, concerns the murder of, and not by, the king's son. In Boisrobert's novel, the king, whose first wife dies in childbirth, has his first-born son falsely declared dead in order to marry Queen Anaxarete, and this son is sent away to be reared by peasants. When years later this son is brought to court, like Segisumndo, he horrifies all by his brutal ignorance. In the Histoire indienne, it is not the brute, who is after all not the king's son, but the king's true first-born son, Lisimante, who meditates on the illusory nature of the world and its vanity. Instead of the metamorphosis of one character from brute to prince, Boisrobert's metamorphosis involves two distinct characters, both of whom remain true to their innate characters in the typically Spanish fashion of "soy quién soy." The boor remains a boor, and Lisimante, whom everyone always suspected of nobility because of his aristocratic demeanor, is discovered to be the

long lost son.

Both Calderón and Boisrobert must have had access to an earlier Spanish text which contained references to the vanity of life, astrology, and a king's son whose mother dies in childbirth and who is suddenly brought to reign at court after having been reared in isolation and ignorance. Examples of works with one of the above themes can be found in classical literature. The point here is that two authors, within a span of six years, linked the same three elements in a single work. If this fact is not coincidental, the two authors must have relied on the same text or texts.

The sources of La Vida es sueño were discussed in Chapter 7. One work was shown to be an undisputed source for the characters and theme; a second, a possible source for the horoscope motif. Peter Dunn considered Castillo Solórzano's novela, "El pronóstico cumplido" published in the Noches de placer (1631) as the most logical source for the prophecy motif and its ambigious fulfillement.[14] Sloman established the unequivocal character and thematic debt of La Vida es sueño to Yerros de naturaleza y aciertos de la fortuna (1634), an earlier play the author wrote in colloboration with Antonio Coello.[15] The 1629 publication of the Histoire indienne antedates the novela by two years and the play by five. The origin of the Histoire indienne remains undetermined, and the study of this text points to the existence of a yet undiscovered source for both Boisrobert and Calderón.

Conclusion. The literary contributions of Boisrobert's Histoire indienne are relatively minor in terms of creative innovation. The novel, with its appearing, disappearing, and reappearing characters, is

overly romanesque. The characters exhibit no psychological depth and are no more than caricatures of what their station in society ordains them to be. They spontaneously fall helplessly and eternally in love with portraits which somehow always materialize to fulfill the beholder's wildest fantasies. Characters are intrinsically good or evil. If good, they are of correspondingly noble birth and beautiful appearance. If evil, they are most often relegated to a lower social condition and are physically unattractive. The sole purpose of the lowly character is to provide obstacles for the good, noble, and beautiful to overcome in order to prove their inherent superiority and gain the hand of their equally superior counterpart. The novel ends in typically romanesque fashion with its protagonists married and living happily ever after.

Boisrobert's Histoire indienne is thus not highly innovative if the criterion is literary creativity. If on the other hand the novel is studied in the light of its role in the initiation of the romanesque genre that was to dominate the literary scene in France for some fifteen years, it is clearly contributory. Boisrobert's major contribution to literature with this novel is to have been one of the first to introduce and popularize the notion of translating and adapting works from an era now known as Spain's "Siglo de Oro."

Notes

[1] Emile Magne, Le Plaisant Abbé de Boisrobert (Paris: Mercure de France, 1909), p. 113.

[2] Antoine Adam, Histoire de la littérature française au XVII[e] siècle (Paris: Domat-Montchrestien, 1958), I, 402.

[3] Adam, II, 121.

[4] Adam, I, 400.

[5] Adam, I, 402.

[6] Adam, I, 402.

[7] Adam, I, 590.

[8] Adam, I, 591.

[9] Adam, I, 402.

[10] François le Métel, Abbé de Boisrobert, "Epistre à Mademoiselle d'Effiat," Histoire indienne d'Anaxandre et d'Orazie ou sont entremeslees les avantures d'Alcidaris, de Cambaye, & les amours de Pyroxene (Paris: François Pomeray, 1629), n. p.

[11] Aristotle, Poetics, in Critical Theory Since Plato, ed. Hazard Adams (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich Inc., 1971), p. 64.

[12] Aristotle, p. 53.

[13] Adam, I, 398.

[14] Peter Dunn, "The Horoscope motif in La Vida es sueño," Atlante, no. 1 (1953), p. 200.

[15] Albert E. Sloman, The Dramatic Craftsmanship of Calderón (Oxford: The Dolphin Book Co. Ltd., 1958), pp. 250-277.

Chapter 9

CONCLUSION

François le Métel, sieur de Boisrobert (1589-1662) was a minor author of relatively little importance who has generally been ignored by literary criticism. It was the object of this dissertation to examine the author's life and prose fiction, and to situate his works within a geographical and historical perspective. Boisrobert spent more than forty years at court, almost twenty of which were spent as Richelieu's favorite. His standing with the cardinal was a privilege often abused by family and friends, and his efforts to obtain pensions, repeals, and favors for others were considerable. As the cardinal's favorite, Boisrobert came in contact with all those of fame. The Epistres en Vers which appeared in two volumes in 1646 and 1659 and which span an approximate period of seventeen years provide a wealth of biographical information on both the author and the age in which he lived. In the "Advis" of the second volume of Epistres, Boisrobert speaks of forty-two years of service at the court. The anonymous and undated pamphlet, the Boscorobertine, similarly refers to the fact that Boisrobert had spent forty-two years at court. Two hypotheses can be conjectured from this figure: Boisrobert came to court in 1617; the approximate date of the Boscorobertine is 1659, the same as that of the second volume of Epistres.

The relationship of Boisrobert and Richelieu can be approximately

traced to the year 1627 when in the Recueil des plus beaux vers, Boisrobert addressed himself to the cardinal in order to ask for the good will of the king. Within five years, Boisrobert was an extremely important personage as a result of the favor he shared with Richelieu. This favor was not to continue with the ascent of Mazarin, and Boisrobert was never able to accept what he considered an unjustified fall from grace. He was to persist in glorifying the years spent as Richelieu's favorite in epistles written as late as 1658, sixteen years after the cardinal's death. References to the abbot's former favor with Richelieu, the loss of standing upon Mazarin's ascent, his love of court and Paris, and his displeasure with provincial life are scattered throughout the second volume of Epistres. The two volumes are a valuable source of biographical and psychological data on Boisrobert, and provide excellent testimony as to the extent of Boisrobert's incessant and enduring obsession with favor at court, and his ultimate inability to accept this loss.

Boisrobert was instrumental in transforming a group of "beaux esprits" gathered at the initiative of Valentin Conrart into a state sponsored and pensioned organization: the French Academy. In 1634, the French Academy became an officially recognized society under the cardinal's patronage. In an epistle written to the Marquis de Leuville in 1651, the abbot maintains that he was the creator and promoter of the French Academy and that Richelieu was the protector:

> Et j'eus encore fortune assez amie
> Quand je formay l'Illustre Academie
> Des beaux esprits: j'en fus le Promoteur,
> Et fis qu'Armand s'en fit le Protecteur. (Epistres, II, 155)

Boisrobert's role in the creation of the Academy was not universally acknowledged by his contemporaries. The authors of the anonymous and prejudicial pamphlet, the Boscorobertine, unjustly attack the abbot as an unworthy member, and conclude that Boisrobert was admitted to this illustrious society solely on the cardinal's favor. Modern critics have now established Boisrobert's influence in creating the French Academy, a role which in itself is sufficient to perpetuate his name.

The nouvelle. The origin of the nouvelle was traced in order to evaluate the originality of the Cervantine novela and its impact on subsequent reproductions. The nouvelle was shown to have originated in the medieval fabliaux and fables, but its more direct source was Boccaccio's Decameron, composed between 1350 and 1355. Marguerite de Navarre's Heptaméron which first appeared in 1558 was modeled on Boccaccio's tales and was initially entitled Le Décaméron. Although the Heptaméron was not without innovation, it was Cervantes' Novelas ejemplares, first published in 1613 and translated into French in 1615, which marked a new era for this genre. The success of the Novelas ejemplares was immediate, and resulted in the proliferation in Spain of this genre by other authors.

The Spanish comedia and novela were closely related in the seventeenth century, and this interrelation produced a comedia novelesca and a novela comediesca. An analogous pattern was proven to exist in the influence that the two genres exerted in France. Theatrical works were adapted from the Spanish novela and French nouvelles were based on Spanish comedias. In 1639, d'Ouville launched a Spanish vogue in the

theater with the appearance of his Esprit folet, a comedy adapted from La dama duende of Calderón. Scarron initiated a similar fashion in prose. The first part of Scarron's Roman comique, which contained two Spanish novelas was published in 1651, and in 1656, he published the Nouvelles tragi-comiques tournées de l'espagnol en français. Both works precede the 1656 publication of d'Ouville's Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaires and Boisrobert's 1657 publication of the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses. These publications contributed to the popularization of the Spanish novela in France and inspired original productions of this genre. The quarrel in which the above authors were embroiled was the consequence of their mutual exploitation of Spanish literature. This study shed new light on a heretofore undetected element in this quarrel thereby nullifying d'Ouville's responsibility and intensifying that of Boisrobert.

Les Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses. A major portion of this dissertation was devoted to an analysis of Les Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses. Published in 1657, this volume consists of four nouvelles, all of which are adaptations. Three of the four nouvelles are, as Boisrobert claims in a prefatory epistle, adaptations of Spanish works. The first tale, "L'Heureux Desespoir" is based on Rotrou's L'Heureuse Constance, which in turn was based on two comedias by Lope de Vega, El Poder vencido y amor premiado and Mirad a quién alabáis. An examination of the above texts produced no evidence that Boisrobert had read the Spanish originals. The second tale, "L'Inceste supposé" is adapted from a novela by María de Zayas, "La Perseguida triunfante." A study of the two tales revealed a mild similarity in

plot and structure and a strong dissimilarity in tone and action. "Plus d'effets que de paroles," a tale adapted by both Boisrobert and Scarron, is based on Tirso de Molina's Palabras y Plumas. The results of this analysis showed that Boisrobert unquestionably utilized Tirso's comedia in his adaptation, but his use of Scarron's title revealed a curious debt to this burlesque version. Boisrobert's last nouvelle, "La Vie n'est qu'un songe," is drawn from Calderón's well known comedia entitled La Vida es sueño. While closely following the action of the comedia, the nouvelle exhibits a distinct preoccupation with classical precepts.

The greatest merit of the Nouvelles is perhaps in their portrayal of contemporary manners. The analysis of Boisrobert's adaptations revealed that the author retained very little that was typically Spanish, and the nouvelles are consequently a representative illustration of the social and cultural distances that existed between the two countries. The fact that the Nouvelles are adaptations instead of translations provides historical and literary information about the two countries which transcends the value of the individual nouvelle. In general, the French nouvelles are intellectual, rational, and portray elements of both the romanesque and the classical. Characters and events which do not conform to French standards were omitted, and only the basic plot adapted. The action of tales such as "L'Inceste supposé" is simple, concentrated and plausible, but also exaggerated and psychologically undeveloped. The Spanish comedias and novelas are baroque, irrational, and sentimental. The action is complex, extended over a greater period of time, and often incorporates elements of the supernatural not to be found in the French counterparts.

Boisrobert's nouvelles represent the spirit of French individualism; the comedias and novelas, that of Spanish collectivism.

The chapter devoted to an examination of the Histoire indienne (1629), Boisrobert's only novel, revealed a relatively minor contribution in terms of creative innovation, but a definite contribution to the initiation of the romanesque genre and the popularization of a Spanish vogue. This examination produced strong evidence that the novel was based on a Spanish text, but did not identify the exact source. The discovery of certain elements in the Histoire indienne which reappear in La Vida es sueño points to the existence of a common text utilized by both authors.

Boisrobert was a minor author of the seventeenth century but is nonetheless notable for his contributions. Among his most noteworthy accomplishments is the creation of the French Academy. This study has disclosed a value in his writings that transcend that of the individual works: the revelation of the probable existence of a yet undiscovered source for La Vida es sueño, as indicated by the analysis of the Histoire indienne; the portrayal of courtly intrigue and politics as seen in the Epistres; and a vivid illustration of the political and philosophical differences which distinguished seventeenth-century France and Spain as exemplified by the Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Boisrobert, François le Métel, Abbé de. Epistres en Vers. 2 vols. Ed. Maurice Cauchie. Paris: Hachette, 1921.

----------. Histoire indienne d'Anaxandre et d'Orazie ou sont entremeslees les auantures d'Alcidaris, de Cambaye, & les amours de Pyroxene. Paris: François Pomeray, 1629.

----------. Les Nouvelles héroïques et amoureuses. Paris: P. Lamy, 1657.

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. La Vida es sueño. In Diez Comedias del Siglo de Oro. Ed José Martel and Hymen Alpern, 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Castillo y Solórzano, Alonso de. Los Alivios de Casandra. Barcelona: J. Romeu, 1640.

----------. La Garduña de Sevilla. In La Novela Picaresca Española. Ed. Angel Valbuena y Prat. Madrid: Aguilar, 1943, vol. II, pp. 356-672.

Cervantes y Saavedra, Miguel de. Novelas ejemplares. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1938.

Ouville, Antoine le Métel, sieur d'. L'Elite des contes du sieur d'Ouville. 2 vols. Introd. G. Brunet. Paris: Libraire des Bibliophiles, 1883.

----------. Histoire et avantures de dona Rufine, fameuse courtisane de Seville. Amsterdam: Sauzet, 1723.

----------. Les Nouvelles amoureuses et exemplaries, composees en espagnol par cette merveille de son sexe, Dona Maria de Zayas Y Sotto Maior. Paris: Luynes, 1656.

Rotrou, Jean. L'Heureuse Constance. In Oeuvres. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1967, vol. II, pp. 429-512.

Salas Barbadillo, Alonso J. de. La Hija de Celestina. In La Novela Picaresca Española. Ed Angel Valbuena y Prat. Madrid: Aguilar, 1943, vol. I, pp. 1110-1147.

Scarron, Paul. Nouvelles Tragi-Comiques. Ed. Jean Cassou. Paris: Stock, Delamain and Boutelleau, 1948.

----------. Oeuvres. Vol. VII. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970. Rpt. Paris: Jean-François Bastien, 1786.

Téllez, Fray Gabriel (Tirso de Molina). Palabras y Plumas. In Obras dramáticas completas. Ed. Blanca de los Ríos. Vol. I. Madrid: Aguilar, 1946, pp. 1157-1215.

Vega, Lope de. "La Desdicha por la honra." In Novelas a la Señora Marcia Leonarda. Ed. John D. and Leora A. Fitz-Gerald. Erlangen: K.B. Hof-und Universitäts-Buchdruckerei von Junge & Sohn, 1913.

----------. Mirad a quién alabáis. In Obras dramáticas. Madrid: Galo Saez, 1930, vol. XIII, pp. 28-59.

----------. El Poder vencido y amor premiado. In Obras dramáticas. Madrid: Rivadeneyra, S.A., 1930, vol. VIII, pp. 530-568.

Zayas y Sotomayor, María de. Desengaños amorosos: Parte segunda del Sarao y Entretenimiento honesto. Ed. Agustín G. de Amezua y Mayo. Madrid: Aldus, S.A. de Artes Gráficas, 1950.

----------. Novelas exemplares y amorosas. Ed. Agustín G. de Amezua. Madrid: Aldus, S.A. de Artes Gráficas, 1948.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adam, Antoine. Histoire de la littérature française au XVII^{e} siècle. 5 vols. Paris: Domat, 1947-1956.

Alexis, François. "De l'Heptaméron à la Princesse de Clèves." RHL (Oct. 1949), 306-321.

Aristotle. Poetics. In Critical Theory Since Plato. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich Inc., 1971, pp. 48-66.

Aury, Dominique. "Défense de la nouvelle." Bulletin de la Guilde du Livre (Oct. 1950), 102-103.

Bourland, Caroline B. The Short Story in Spain in the Seventeenth Century. Northampton: Smith College, 1927.

Baldner, Ralph W. "Aspects of the Nouvelle in France between 1600 and 1660." MLQ (Dec. 1961), 351-357.

----------. "The Nouvelles Françaises of Segrais." MLQ, 18 (1957), 199-205.

----------. "Theory and Practice of the Nouvelle in France from 1600 to 1660." Diss. University of California 1957.

Barber, John. "A Seventeenth-Century View of French Literature." French Studies, II (April 1948), 140-147.

Batiffol, Louis. Le Siècle de la Renaissance. Paris: Hachette, [1936].

Bjornson, Richard. The Picaresque Hero in European Fiction. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1977.

Carcopino, Jerome. Boisrobert. Paris: Elvire Choureau and Georges Blaizot, 1963.

Cauchie, Maurice. Documents pour servir à l'histoire littéraire du XVII^e siècle. Paris: Libraire Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1924.

Chardon, Henri. Scarron Inconnu. 2 vols. Paris: Champion, 1903.

Cioranescu, Al. "Calderón y el Teatro francés." Estudios de literatura española comparada. Tenerife, Canary Islands: Universidad de la Laguna, 1954, 139-195.

Clements, Robert, and Joseph Gibaldi. Anatomy of the Novella. New York: New York University Press, 1977.

Coke, James Wilson. "Antoine Le Métel, sieur d'Ouville: His Life and his Theatre." Diss. Indiana University 1958.

Crooks, Esther J. The Influence of Cervantes in France in the Seventeenth Century. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1931.

Dallas, Dorothy. Le Roman Français de 1660 à 1680. Paris: Librairie Universitaire J. Gamber, 1932.

De Armas, Frederick A. "Antoine Le Métel, Sieur d'Ouville: the Lost Years." Romance Notes, vol. XIV, no. 3, 1973, pp. 538-543.

----------. Paul Scarron. New York: Twayne, 1972.

----------. "The Four Interpolated Stories in the Roman Comique: their sources and unifying function. Diss. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971.

----------. "The Invisible Mistress Plot in Seventeenth-Century French Literature." Brockport: State University College of N.Y. Department of Foreign Languages and Literature (1972), p. 1-11.

Deloffre, Frédérick. La Nouvelle en France à l'Age Classique. Paris: Didier, 1967.

Dunn, Peter. Castillo Solórzano and the Decline of the Spanish Novel. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.

----------. "The Horoscope Motif in La Vida es sueño." Atlante, No. 4 (1953), 187-201.

El Saffar, Ruth S. Novel to Romance: A Study of Cervantes's "Novelas ejemplares." Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1974.

Godenne, René. "Comment Appeler un Auteur de Nouvelles." Romanic Review, LVIII (1967), 38-43.

----------. "Les Débuts de la Nouvelle Narrée à la Première Personne (1645-1800)." Romanische Forschungen, 82 (1970), 253-267.

----------. Histoire de la Nouvelle Française aux XVII^{e} et XVIII^{e} Siècles. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1970.

Green, Frederick. "The Critic of the Seventeenth Century and His Attitude toward the French Novel." Modern Philology (Feb. 1927), 285-295.

Guichemerre, Roger. "Une Source Peu Connue de Molière: Le Théâtre de Le Métel d'Ouville." RHL, LXV (1965), 92-102.

Hainsworth, G. "New Details on the Nouvelles of Scarron and Boisrobert." Bulletin Hispanique (1947), 145-169.

----------. "Les 'Novelas Exemplares' de Cervantes en France au XVII^{e} siècle. 1933; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971.

----------. "Quelques Opinions françaises (1614-1664) sur les Nouvelles exemplaires de Cervantes (1613)." Bulletin Hispanique, XXXII, no. 1 (Jan-Mar. 1930), 63-70.

----------. "Une Ramification curieuse dans la bibliographie cervantesque: la fortune de la première traduction française des Novelas ejemplares." Bulletin Hispanique, XXXII, no. 1 (Jan-Mar. 1930), 259-267.

Hippeau, Célestin. Les Ecrivains normands au XVII^{e} siècle. 1786; rpt. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.

Küsop, W. "Les Nouvelles Tragicomiques de Scarron." In Bibliographie matérielle et critique textuelle. Paris: 1970.

Lancaster, Henry Carrington. Five French Farces. 1655-1694? Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937.

----------. A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century. 4 pts. in 8 vols. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1929-1940.

Lanson, Gustave. "Etudes sur les Rapports de la Littérature Française et de la Littérature Espagnole au XVII^{e} Siècle (1600-1660)." Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France (1896), 45-70.

Leiner, W. Widmungsbrief in der französischen Literatur, 1580-1715. Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1965.

Magne, Emile. Bibliographie générale des oeuvres de Scarron. Paris: Ancienne Librairie Leclerc L. Giraud-Badin, 1924.

----------. "La Jeunesse de Boisrobert." Mercure de France, I-VI (1909), 428-442.

----------. Le Plaisant Abbé de Boisrobert. Paris: Mercure de France, 1909.

----------. Scarron et son Milieu. Paris: Emile-Paul Freres, 1924.

Malkiewicz, Marie. "Un Remaniement français de La Vie est un songe." Revue de Littérature Comparée (1939), 429-444.

Martinenche, Ernest. La Comedia espagnole en France de Hardy à Racine. Paris: Hachette, 1900.

Mathorez, J. "Notes sur l'Infiltration des Espagnols en France aux XVII^e et XVIII^e Siècles." Bulletin Hispanique, 34 (1932), 27-51.

Morillot, P. "Le Roman." In Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature française des Origines à 1900. Ed. Le Petit de Julleville. Paris: Armand Colin, 1897, vol. IV, pp. 407-462.

----------. Scarron: Etude biographique et littéraire. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970; rpt. Paris: 1888.

Nuñez, Concepción Alvarez. "Notas Sobre Algunas Novelas Históricas Francesas del Siglo XVII de Tema Español." RL, XVII (1960), 101-132.

Palomo, María del Pilar. Ed. Tirso de Molina: Obras. Barcelona: Vergara S.A., 1968, pp. 11-130.

Poncela, Serrano. "Casamientos Engañosos." Bulletin Hispanique, LXIV (1962), 248-259.

Reynal, Marie-Aline. La Nouvelle française de Segrais à Mme de La Fayette. Diss. Toulouse. Paris: Picart, [1926].

Reynier, Gustave. Le Roman Réaliste au XVII^e Siècle. Paris: Hachette, 1914.

----------. Le Roman Sentimental avant l'Astrée. Paris: Armand Colin, 1908.

Rolfe, Franklin P. "On the Bibliography of Seventeenth-Century Prose Fiction." PMLA (1934), 1071-1086.

Schmidt, Albert-Marie. "Le Trésor des Nouvelles françaises." Bulletin de la Guilde du Livre (Oct. 1950), 193-195.

Sloman, Albert E. The Dramatic Craftsmanship of Calderón. Oxford: The Dolphin Book Co. Ltd., 1958.

Tallemant des Reaux. Le Cardinal de Richelieu: Sa Famille, son Favori Bois-Robert. Ed. Emile Magne. Paris: Bossard, 1920.

Tenner, Fritz. François le Métel de Bois-Robert als Dramatiker und Nachahmer des spanischen Dramas. Leipzig: Buchdruckerei M. Wachsmuth, 1907.

Thomas, Henri. "La Nouvelle et le Conte." Bulletin de la Guilde du Livre, 210-212.

Valbuena y Prat, Angel. Calderón: su personalidad, su arte dramático, su estilo y sus obras. Barcelona: Juventud, S.A., 1941.

Vasileski, Irma V. María de Zayas y Sotomayor: su época y su obra. Madrid: Playor, S.A., 1972.

Wardropper, Bruce W. Ed. Critical Essays on the Theatre of Calderón. New York: New York University Press, 1965.

Whitby, William. "Rosaura's Role in the Structure of La Vida es sueño." Hispanic Review, XXVIII (1960), 16-27.

Yudin, Florence Lillian. "Genre Identity in the Golden Age: The Post-Cervantine Novela Corta and the Comedia." Diss. University of Illinois 1964.

VITA

Katherine S. King was born in Jena, Louisiana on March 7, 1950, and was educated in the Louisiana public school system. She was graduated cum laude from Louisiana State University in 1972 with a double major in Spanish and French. As an undergraduate, she participated in study programs in Mexico and in Canada. She continued her graduate studies at Louisiana State University where she held a teaching assistantship in French. She received her Master of Arts degree in 1975, and in the summer of this year attended Bryn Mawr's summer study program in Avignon, France. She is now a candidate for a Doctor of Philosophy degree in French, and will be joining the faculty at The Lovett School in Atlanta, Georgia.

EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Katherine S. King

Major Field: French

Title of Thesis: Boisrobert's Nouvelles Heroiques et Amoureuses and the Histoire Indienne: His Prose Adaptations from the Spanish

Approved:

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Date of Examination:

May 10, 1979